

STUDIES
IN
POLITICAL ECONOMY
by
J. C. L. SIMONDE DE SISMONDI
(translated by John Vertegaal)

I

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

Sismondi's 'Studies' is a work in three volumes, of which only the latter two deal with political economy and are included in this translation. In the preface and introduction of political economy's first volume, he does give readers some ideas of what his volume I, 'constitutional politics' is all about (indicating there that no other preface exists). However, while Sismondi's fundamental ideas on political economy have stood up well to the test of time, at least in the translator's opinion, the same can't be said in reference to his 'constitutional politics'. So enough said about volume I, by me, therefore.

Sismondi's genius, not only significantly fore-ran both Marx and Keynes, but in many respects was even bettering the conclusions by probably the most famous economists of the 19th and 20th century. In essence this was because Sismondi's ideas, about how an economy works most efficiently, were at its core inherently dynamic; like, fulfilling as its purpose, the enduring happiness FOR ALL within society. To Sismondi the production of material things, at anyone time, was meaningless. One will find him concluding more than once that the aggregate value of things may well have decreased, even though their produced quantity had been increasing. This, he reasons, is because things in the current order aren't worth what they are costing to produce, but only what their replacement is costing¹; and, given the ever ongoing improvements in production methods, read: labor-saving devices, lowering wages per unit cost, and especially a consequent drive to compete, puts the economy in a disequilibrating mode of both over-production and under-selling or price cutting. Market clutter, due to the first, was an evil to be avoided by all means; and he shows by statistical evidence that increased production, outside a pre-existing demand for those goods, not only results in bad outcomes for workers, but for capitalist producers as well; as now, with less domestic buying power, having to export their merchandise, and seeing profits decline to the point of increasingly occurring bankruptcies.

1 This situation will be revisited, going somewhat beyond Sismondi, more formally in a later footnote; formal in its meaning of any system wherein (accounting) arithmetic, and not higher math, is of the essence. Higher math and even algebra requires that its subjects are naturally physical; and it will become clear soon that a human-made economy cannot be considered as such coherently. While an algebraic (and higher mathematical) approach to economics is thus inapplicable, a conclusion Sismondi already reached in 1803, an arithmetical formalization in terms of an economy's accounting entries in no way means a diminished one.

II

All micro-economic reasoning in terms of material things supplied is thus rejected; instead, his criterion is the realization of an effective-demand (macro) world economy.

But Sismondi was so much more than just a demand-side economist like Malthus, a bandwagon Keynes would jump on to about a century later. He reasoned there to be a fundamental difference between territorial wealth, a subject first approached in his earliest work (1801) on political economy: 'Tableau de l'agriculture Toscane'; and commercial wealth, the subject of his next title: 'De la richesse commerciale' (1803). The first he ascertained to produce 'usance' values, with about $\frac{3}{4}$ of the workforce employed in the field of agriculture, never entering the 'exchangeable' values produced commercially for the market. But not only that; usance values were very much commonsensical positive values, and conducive to surplus-value creation, while exchangeable values, as loaded with monetary instead of foodstuff advances, were incurred debts. Profits made on their behalf were aleatory or haphazard, and made at accounted-for losses elsewhere. Then in the beginning of his final Essay he realizes, that, as seen from the perspective of the part of the economy where exchangeable values are produced, not only its circulating capital, or the advances having been made from the national fortune, as he usually calls the total underlying capital of all commercial wealth, but the entire national fortune itself, cannot be more than a portfolio claim on the far-from-certain success of future production also; and thus, rather than a real [depletable] asset, is a to-be-made-good economic debt, too.

Unfortunately, just as things appear to get real interesting, Sismondi fails to give it the attention it deserves and develop this idea further; or perhaps he was just loath to explain at the end of his career and seriously ill, what all this would mean for the term 'fortune', or capital, which he had been using throughout this work and especially in its introduction and first two Essays as very much being of positive assistance to industrial production. In other words, although his thoughts were no doubt still evolving, he is seriously contradicting himself here. But also don't forget that in his time, the agricultural sector was still enormous and the commercial sector thus correspondingly small. And as Sismondi indicated, until quite recently, everyone in the former got paid in foodstuffs; to then only afterwards share a bit of that produce for some coins obtained as wages by workers in the commercial sector, who weren't in a position to barter their output. But the situation couldn't be more different nowadays. For not only has direct farming employment dropped to well below 2% of the total workforce, now no one gets paid in kind anymore. Sismondi's conclusion that all commercial capital is an economic debt to be resolved, rather than a superfluity of depletable positive assets, is backed up by the indisputable logic of cost accounting as absolutely right. Every formal economic activity is a booked entry, and capital investments, just like all the other expenditures made, show up on the debit side of accounts; awaiting their returns there as capital, but never to move over to the positive, credit side. Capital without returns is valueless; and if no returns, there is no economy

III

to analyze or account for. An economy, regardless its materiality, stands, progresses, or falls, solely by the status of its formal but non-material accounts. And whatever happens outside the latter, however considerable, stays outside; having no way to influence those booked entries in any way for the better. Alas, being right isn't quite good enough; Sismondi lacked the coherency and comprehensiveness to be able to answer theoretically the 'how-to' question, self-admittedly as shown, posed by his criterion. Now unless proven wrong from a set of realistic first principles, the logic of cost accounting is bound to shake economics down to its very core. And this would include Marxist economics as well, for Marx, after having plagiarized Sismondi's two incarnations of capital, its 'fictitious' alternate, use -, exchange -, and surplus values, in all likelihood never read his last Essay in 'Studies'; so he didn't get to grasp the ultimate meaning of commercial "wealth" and, as dictated by his point of departure, not only remained a Ricardian-style supply-side economist, but also made an outright fool of himself in his "explanation" of the replacement of depreciating, *positively* valued material capital in accounting terms. Instead, with this yet most significant effort², he proved, for all intents and purposes and however inadvertently it happened, that if a 'continuation' is the underlying criterion; of which replacing the existing is a crucial aspect; materialist 'formation only' "logic", as indicating the existence of a positivity, is a non-reality. This would be holding true as much for a neoclassical interpretation of an economy's workings as it would be for Marxism; for an economy that cannot logically replace itself can't possibly exist. Once one accepts non-material accounting (positive credits as resolving earlier acquired negative debits) as valid in principle, materialist determinants (like: embodied labor, or the utility of produced things), will render any explanation of economic behavior as self-contradictory; for in philosophy, nothing can be its own opposite (a positive determinant somewhere and a negative to be resolved in an other connotation) within any one thesis. But while Marx likely went to his grave in puzzlement, as to why he could not reason himself in the clear on this; his true-believing acolytes are, even today, still falling en-mass for Marx's desperate subterfuge – trying to save his "highbrow" 'scientific methodology', by positing capitalists' off-the-books' bartering or otherwise exchanging their positively valued capital amongst themselves, regardless of the obvious implausibility of Marx's own examples. The real tragedy of it all however, lies in the enormous waste of time, and the consequently endured inequities suffered by the working classes since that time; with Marx, while derisively mentioning Sismondi in the Communist Manifesto as a petty-bourgeois socialist, passing on the chance to stand on his shoulders as an economist, but

2 http://ciml.250x.com/archive/marx_engels/english/tpv.pdf Ch. 3, mainly sect. 10; entitled: "Inquiry into How It Is Possible for the Annual Profit and Wages to Buy the Annual Commodities, which besides Profit and Wages also contain Constant Capital". A more detailed critique: http://www.vcn.bc.ca/~vertegaa/Marx_Debunked.pdf

preferring instead to stand on his own two feet as a plagiarist. Hopefully, Sismondi will now

IV

finally receive the recognition, for having been the true originator of an imperative class-struggle economics, he so richly deserves. So, having reached the limit of Sismondi's analysis at this point, let's next discover what the bulk of these Studies, named 'Essais' in French, is all about. One could say that its underlying leitmotif is his battle with the orthodox school of economic thought, he calls the chrematistic approach to political economy, or the science of wealth as represented by *things* in the abstract. This 'formation' approach, he says, not only is contradicted by the ever deteriorating experiences of the working class; and by the way, as far as I'm concerned, he wipes the floor with Ricardo's counterarguments³ by showing the latter to be abstracting from an indispensable dynamics, that needs generations to work itself out; but it no longer even truly follows the etymological meaning of political economy itself. The latter he defines as the 'rule of the household and the city'. This makes sense as in latinized ancient Greek, polis means city, oikos is house, and nomikos is rule. The etymological meaning of modern economics, is clear also. However in its chrematistic significance, it loses the essence of distribution and especially plurality; and the latter is indispensable if a working economy cannot be reduced to agglomerated individuals set *in* time. When Sismondi argues in terms of goal-oriented individuals needing to form each other's reciprocal *over* time, because "as consumers they reimburse all the advances made in the production of its commodities", he realized this was true, I know it to be true; but the point is to imprint this reality on the readers of 'Studies'; who likely will be reading it from an economics' point of view, in a quest to know how our economy works. I have therefore taken it upon myself to translate his 'cité' with 'community'; first of all, because as 'koino' it is a cognitive, and second because it would also be dispensing with the need for 'political'. A household as a rule is a small community in fact already, and as such it needs to contend with its members' wishes to continue as a household; implying that some inequality is mutually agreeable, and thus is considered by all as a valid continuity factor, but only to the limit of it leading to a greater good for all. Sismondi explicitly acknowledges this sentiment too, though in my opinion from a somewhat elitist perspective, in that the perception of the greater good for all, cannot be taken from democratic principles; which is doubtlessly true enough for the household, but in a larger setting? Yet, perhaps these anti-democratic thoughts were somewhat justifiable in his day; for during his extensive travels in the past he had observed large swatches of the population not only analphabetic, but totally devoid of any worldly knowledge and living in abject squalor. Anyway, Sismondi did concede that democracy could well come into its

3 Sismondi takes on MacCulloch's arguments as well, and shows the absurdness and utter unworldliness the latter, as a 'formation' economist, needs to resort to in trying to make his case stick. (Vol. 2, p. 221)

own once every one, like he considered the Greeks in antiquity to have been, would be equal.

In all his Essays, Sismondi shows himself to be an outstanding humanist. But, as must be expected from works written almost two centuries ago,

V

most are severely dated. Slavery, ancient and “modern” colonialism, the deserted *Agro Romano*, the plight of the Irish, the English textile workers, the uprooting of thousands of Scottish farmers to then be replaced by a few dozen foreign shepherders; and also, the almost idyllic living conditions of Tuscans he repeatedly compares their plight to. Yet, even if occurring only sporadically, throughout these Essays he comes up with remarkable insights⁴ that are original, sometimes unique, with most still valid a couple of centuries onward in economics’ thought; and even can be regarded as putting him a step ahead of modern interpretations of such phenomena.

A few examples are: he realized that the ultimate reason for taxation is to effectuate [equilibrating] arrangements that share private-sector final output with those presently in receipt of government’s own disbursements, and he thus doesn’t stop with (following a false linear logic) enabling a government to direct its expenditures at whatever level it sees as correct; arguing that such taxation should be progressive; realizing that all (money) capital solely arises as a claim to future output; contending that the negative values of claims, in monetary terms, may well survive the destruction of the positive entities that would have been underlying them (though not consciously realizing that the non-resolution of those claims is the very reason of positive-entity destruction⁵); arguing that undeserved

4 The most remarkable no doubt is that he foresaw from the way things were going, and under the goal set by the directives of chrematistics as far as economies of scale and centralization were concerned: “a single super-merchandiser billionaire, in direct contact with the most distant consumers, while annihilating all intermediaries”. Also, having proposed profit sharing by workers, “bringing them back from a status of mechanical agents to that of thinking beings endowed with a will”, he had severe misgivings, for the same reason of how things were going, that “such an expedient would ever become workable”.

I guess the running of Huawei; quite possibly the most successfully conducted business on the planet two centuries onward, evoking the ire of the world’s financial elites because, as a consequence of it being an employee-owned business, there is no way to extract a share of revenue, and don’t forget their faithful lackey, the American DoJ (sic); was just beyond his ratiocinative horizon.

5 Herein lies the essence of needing to go beyond Sismondi in order to reason why the inequities of the economic system during his time, while much more severe in their effect, haven’t really stopped in modern times; only their causes have become more obscure to detect. For it is the non-resolution in terms of final output, of particularly interest claims by the financial sector, that keeps the rest of the economy in a state of inescapable bondage. An economy barely growing at 2% of GDP per capita year over year, cannot possibly function unscathed at rates of interest on commercial loans, as a presumed impetus to that growth*, and/or lines of credit, that are way in excess of that. It is therefore absolutely crucial that the question be asked to and especially answered by financiers and autocratic rate setters: where is all this economic-rent “money” supposed to be coming from? What if the inescapable defaults in the non-

credit to some may well ruin the whole economy; contending that free trade is a good thing only insofar both countries will mutually benefit, but instead is detrimental when its purpose is to destroy another country's industries; brilliantly concluding as to why, from an effective-demand perspective, the value of kept slaves, as an accumulated capital, is nil; reasoning, from a god-given equality of the right to develop one's mental faculties in leisure, not only the limits to worldly property rights, but in making man more valuable to society's progress as a whole; contending that banks are always eager to lend to governments, knowing that the latter, having the power of taxation, are most unlikely to default; arguing that beneficent motives, instead of greed and utility calculations, result in greater outputs and ease overall... So, how far does Sismondian demand-side economic reasoning get one in understanding how our economy really works? First off, it should be made clear that all his critics, including me, agree that Sismondi was hardly a consistent theoretician. One example that stands out here in his 'Studies', even though insignificant in the overall scheme of things, is the rightful trashing of Mercantilism, to only then turn around and contend that the small capital kept in the coffers of emigres represents a loss to the mother country. But then again, the same could be said of Keynes, like Marx, a closet Sismondian in my opinion⁶, whose inconsistency in Mercantilism's merit is well known too. Other examples, showing Sismondi in particular being hindered by having to reason from a commodity-based numeraire, appear from time to time also. No doubt it would have been helpful if, like Sismondi's 'New Principles', 'Studies' was critiqued in detail, but time is pressing and I still have other things to do... Sismondi's great lament, he keeps on repeating in several of his Essays, is that visualizing a new order that can be legislated into place, (rejecting any kind of revolution outright, as being too destructive) is well beyond him. He saw his task as pointing out the faults of the existing order, in its blind following of chrematistic principles; and the iniquities, piling up in his time, were to be ameliorated through legislation. Although in some respects the great leap that society has made, since the evils of the industrial revolution taking place in and before his time, could be seen as having proved him wrong; substantial inequities have remained – showing

financial sectors are in fact *caused* by the non-resolving actions of the financial sector; that sacrificial lambs *are* its modus vivendi, solely as a means to exert their unbridled egotistical power? And the same in essence goes for the need of a coherent and generally acceptable theory of what money actually *is*; so as to finally, through impeccable logic, being able to put an end to the devastating charade that is being perpetrated in finances.

* Instead, such empirically found real-growth rate is much more likely to solely have come about through having 'learned-by-doing', and subsequently realized through profit-income re-spending; which would leave just about all finance causatively nowhere, and becoming most aptly described as a multi-trillion euro/dollar government condoned "entitlement" program.

For Sismondi's own, unique theory of growth, not dealt with in these Essays – <http://www.vcn.bc.ca/~vertegaa/sismondi.pdf> (Vol. I, Book II, Ch. 6).

6 Concerning Keynes, this is argued in the same place too – <http://www.vcn.bc.ca/~vertegaa/sismondi.pdf> (p. 20).

that the capitalist system, and especially the unbridled financial aspect of it, is unsustainable.

The key to it all lies in something Sismondi only implicitly recognized: economics on the basis of macro-accounting and a feasible reciprocity⁷

VII

of all its activities. (i.e.) The economy's causes and effects are non-linear reciprocally structured, leaving it indeterminate at all times; with a given underlying end purpose that is undeniable by any of its active participants, and that moreover is located exogenous to an economy. The latter, like all human-made tools or subsets, is binary. Either it works, or it doesn't work to the expected extent; and the reason why, or why not, cannot ever be mysterious when its purpose to the set is indisputable. This would mean that all endogenous linear reasoning from a given static point of departure, like $Y=C+I$, is wrong; thus another first principle, this time a Keynesian one, is falling by the wayside. Hence the need arises to throw out all the economics' textbooks and start over again. Enjoy the 'Studies'.

⁷ At least in the back of his mind it must certainly have occurred to Sismondi that the situation surrounding his "super-merchandise billionaire", by far exceeded any feasible reciprocity. In conclusion: as said, we'll find Sismondi lamenting on more than one occasion, his difficulty with visualizing the working parameters of an altogether new system from behind the blinders of the system currently in force. We no longer face that constraint, however. There already is an alternative system that successfully has been operating ever since the post-war period. Conceived in the Basque country of northern Spain, in a municipality called Mondragón, it wholly fulfills the reciprocity requisite of an efficient economy. In light of the fact that only a tiny fraction of one percent of the cost of any certain kind of available retail product exceeds the ratio of 1:7, the reasons for anyone to be remunerated in excess of that ratio are already dramatically reduced. And, as their saved "resource" is creatable out of thin air; if, for whatever reason, in some or other economic sector, an ordinary experience-induced natural growth isn't deemed enough of a needed boost; starting from scratch again is only different in not having been iniquitous before. In any case the risk, as to whether the new investment will indeed pan out or not, is always borne by existing fellow workers to the new hirelings, who will need to share existing retail goods with the latter, until derivative additional final output becomes available later. It can in fact be shown that remunerations above the ratio of 1:7, resulting in an aggregate *net* saving, can only result in unrepayable debt, and a social distress due to involuntary unemployment.

So I believe Sismondi would be more than pleased that a system, so close to following his own ideas on an economy's workings, is indeed legislatable in law through specific tax measures and incentives; even though it would take, in his view dubious, democracy to make it happen.

FIRST VOLUME
BRUSSELS, 1837

1

ANALYTICAL INDEX BY SUBJECT

PREFACE

Page

- i Universal activity in the study of the social sciences, during the last sixty years.
- ii For forty years I have been associated with many of the discussions on these sciences.
- ii Desire to collect my articles on these subjects; what prevented me.
- ii I have endeavored to reconstruct a single work from these separate Essays.
- iii I have deleted, added, modified, and changed the dispersion of these Essays.
- iv Even the interrupted work will not be incomplete; each volume having a special purpose.
- v Purpose of the first volume [n/a]: to ensure sovereignty of the enlightened will, rather than the number of constituents.
- v Aim of the second and third: to ensure the enjoyment of all, rather than the progress of a few.
- vi Constitutional and economic studies have the same goal, the greatest good of all.
- viii Preeminence is based on the advantage of a very few, practicing their influence over the many.
- viii Subjects treated in this volume II, and in those that will follow in volume III.

INTRODUCTION

- 1 After having sought the formation of the national will, we turn to the subjects on which it is exercised [n/a].
- 2 Importance of subsistence; all moral incentives depend on it.
- 3 Chrematistics deals with wealth, political economy deals with the orderliness of the house and the community.
- 3 The word wealth has meaning only by relating it to the one who enjoys it.
- 4 The idea of wealth becomes confused as soon as it exceeds our primary needs.
- 5 The products of the arts are less valuable the more society makes more progress in producing.

2

- 6 Share of enjoyments that social wealth must guarantee to the poor.

Page

- 6 Share of enjoyment of the rich, to which must be added leisure.
- 7 Use of leisure for the development of oneself, of the superfluous for the relief of others.
- 8 Another use of wealth being useful to all: the search for beauty in everything charitable.
- 9 In what proportion it is desirable that the rich should be involved in the state of the nation.
- 9 Current triumph of chrematistics, accumulation of things that man desires.
- 10 Have the pleasures of man increased with this accumulation of things?
- 11 In Italy, many of the houses indicate a past prosperity much higher than the present one.
- 11 Palaces of commerce in Italy, palaces of the nobility, in the capital and the provinces.
- 12 'Castelli', formerly fortified towns; ancient independence of their inhabitants.
- 13 The Italians had created this wealth without having made any of the progress which we brag about.
- 14 Search for the share of wealth assured to the poor in times gone by.
- 14 State of the villains in the old regimes; their rights, and abuses that they were suffering.
- 15 The villain's contract would have been advantageous, if it had not become subject to arbitrariness.
- 16 Corporations of the cities, guarantees they gave to the bourgeoisie.
- 17 Monopoly of the bourgeoisies; it prevented abundance, cheapness, and improvements.
- 18 But it ensured much happiness to all the craft guild members of the community.
- 19 Is it sure that by promoting the material creation of wealth we have spread more happiness?
- 20 Apart from political oppression, in the past, work was well paid in the city and in the fields.
- 20 The current order based on universal competition; as a theory.
- 21 Advice on selfishness given to all; these have been followed too well.
- 22 Everyone's work to produce more and more, instability of the fortunes made due to commerce.
- 22 Everyone is working to produce more cheaply. All progress means a saving of labor or wages.
- 23 Before universal competition, progress never impoverished the worker.
- 24 Universal competition has made the poor a 'proletarian'.
- 25 Urban day laborers, the first proletarians created by having abolished the corporations of the old order.

Page

- 25 The day laborers of the countryside, the proletarians of large farm cultivation.
- 26 The concentration of capital pushes the independent industrialist into the ranks of the proletarians.
- 27 Savings obtained in England from reducing the number of its cultivators.
- 28 Large capitals also are suppressing the workers in factories.
- 29 Striving to do in fact by proletarians, everything that craftsmen used to do in the past.
- 29 Wanting to replace the industrial homework done by women.
- 31 Frightening appearance of pauperism, arising from the pressure exerted on the proletarians.
- 31 Recognizing the need for 'legal charity', and the impossibility of it sufficing.
- 32 Real misery of the enriched society. Let's study the facts and the class and condition of any man.
- 33 FIRST ESSAY – Balance of Consumption with Production.
- 33 Revolution in the industrial world for over sixty years. Prejudices that withered manual work.
- 34 A gentleman only allows himself to gain through violence.
- 34 Gentlemen glassblowers.
- 35 All the ennobled, all the enriched, also renounced work.
- 35 The capital of the rich, repelled by the laws on usury, does not animate work.
- 36 Nowadays work has been ennobled, and proclaimed a benefactor of the human species.
- 37 All capital activated by credit is put at the service of industry.
- 38 Scientists work to make science improve production.
- 39 Work of the rich is founding workshops out of patriotic zeal.
- 39 Speed with which industrial discoveries are imitated everywhere.
- 40 As much as labor and capital were lacking sixty years ago, so are they overabundant today.
- 41 Gandalin and the broomstick, or the machine man.
- 42 Chrematistics encourages us to produce more and more, without giving a thought to 'oversaturated'.
- 43 But Malthus foresaw the balance of consumption with production.
- 43 For twenty years we have been asking that work be commensurate with society's aim.
- 45 Two fundamental questions: balance of production, and the nature of revenue.
- 45 Proportion between production and consumption of the isolated man.
- 46 He distinguishes his subsistence, his consumption fund, and his fund of reserves.

47 Society also distributes its products among these three funds.

48 Commerce administers reserve funds, and rejects any superfluous
production.

49 There is less superfluous accumulation after the introduction of
commerce than before.

50 The separation of conditions prevents everyone from measuring
their work to the demand requirement for it.

50 The interest of the three classes of producers pushes them all to
produce in ever greater quantities.

51 Some sense a limit in domestic consumption, and thus want to
produce for export.

52 General congestion results, if all nations followed this system.

53 But according to the English school, all production is a cause of
consumption.

54 Flaw in reasoning based on an absurd assumption.

54 Consumption really increases only with the population in
combination with its means to pay.

55 Long note in refutation of Mr. Ricardo's system of exchanges.

56 Not all production leads to revenue, nor does all revenue lead to
consumption.

58 Ease induces luxury consumption instead of necessities' spending.

62 Manufacture and luxury agriculture employ fewer hands than
those of producing necessary foodstuffs.

62 Struggle of the employer against the worker; consequence of a new
organization of industries.

63 The first organization was the slavery of workers; its disastrous
effects.

64 Then came serfdom, then companionship and association by trade
guilds.

64 Finally came the struggle between all who own and all who work.

65 The congestion of the markets only started with this last struggle.

66 The ancients, however, were concerned with preventing the excess
of production over consumption.

67 Egyptian system: employ superfluous workers, to producing
necessities at any time, to create State monuments, not luxury
items.

68 Sybarite system: to consume excess production in luxury.

69 Athenian system: occupy the citizen of the homeland, to distract
him from productive work.

71 The luxury of Athens was to produce superior men, not riches.

72 We must aspire to guarantee to those who do the work a sufficient
share in its yields.

72 Indirect remedies; greater division of inheritances.

73 There is no real prosperity unless demand precedes production.

75 We can count on the vital force of society to repair minor

disturbances.

Page

76 Often, too, prejudice battles greed, for the benefit of all.

5

77 Introducing an unsolicited industry is to bring suffering, not wealth.

78 SECOND ESSAY – Social Revenue

78 Apparent contradiction in the suffering that abundance causes; or market clutter.

78 Contradiction is only in words, science is led astray by following the words.

79 All false systems arise from the abstract definitions of wealth.

81 Adam Smith, instead of rising to abstractions, always descended from society to man.

81 Emerging societies: each provides for its needs and trades only what is superfluous.

82 Enriched societies: everyone, instead of living on their products, obtains all their sustenance on the market.

83 Limits within which each family buys that what is needed for its consumption.

83 Each one settles on one's revenue; on what, "can be consumed per day".

84 The consumption of a nation is all that it can do without exceeding its revenue.

85 A nation runs to ruin, if it eats up its capital along with its revenue.

85 For each and everyone, revenue does not always increase with production.

86 Aleatory profit, or from gambling, does not enter into common revenue.

87 Each one regulates the formation and growth of his family, based on his revenue.

88 Revenue regulates population growth, both for society and for the family.

89 For the lack of subsistence to stop the population, circumstances would be necessary that we will never see.

90 While every day the population is measured on its means of existence.

91 Economists, not knowing how to define revenue, have avoided mentioning it.

92 However all the most important questions regarding an economy depend on revenue.

92 Social revenue is the sum of everyone's revenue: we cannot be more specific.

93 But social wealth, itself, presents itself to us in a way just as vague.

Page

- 94 Its enumeration was, however, sufficient to dispel much in the way of error.
- 94 In an isolated family, working for itself, the origin of revenue is discovered.
- 95 Even though it resembles the circulation of blood, its nature remains mysterious.

6

- 96 For the good of work, it must give up on increasing the quantity, and focus on quality instead.
- 96 The quantity of anything produced is regulated by the number of its consumers, its quality by the ease its consumers.
- 97 Commerce has brought all interests together, in a way by all acting against each other.
- 97 Producers seek to replace each other, instead of being proportioned to demand.
- 99 The population of Europe doesn't increase by more than one percent per year.
- 99 Production should therefore not increase by more than one percent.
- 99 But the farmer, who thinks only of selling, does not stop there.
- 100 He may be increasing his own revenue, but he is decreasing that of of farming as a whole.
- 100 When farm revenues decline, farmers' consumption also decreases.
- 100 The consumption of clothing is also limited in quantity and quality.
- 103 The skill of the manufacturer in the main consists of underselling his competitors.
- 103 But if this decreases their revenue, it also lessens the number and buying power of consumers.
- 104 So there may be too many products and at the same time too little available revenue.
- 105 Since special interests tend to harm each other, they must be contained.
- 106 We will first analyze the struggle of agricultural interests.

FIRST SECTION

Territorial Wealth and the Condition of the Farmers.

- 107 THIRD ESSAY – What is the Distribution of Territorial Wealth that Brings the Most Happiness to Society.
- 107 Importance of work, guarantees to be given to workers.
- 108 Study of human conditions: the first in importance is that which brings forth the fruits of the earth.
- 108 Exchange of labor with the land – territorial wealth; with other men – commercial wealth.

Page

- 109 Reasons for the government's preference for commercial wealth:
it multiplies cash and credit.
- 110 J.-B. Say sees in agriculture nothing but the net profit of farmers.

7

- 111 Territorial wealth is the greatest of national interests: doubt on land
appropriation.
- 112 Common soil among hunting and pastoral peoples; its unfortunate
consequences.
- 113 Beginnings of cultivation among these peoples: their plots of soil
changed every year.
- 114 Experience has shown that the appropriation of land is beneficial to
all.
- 114 As soon as society guaranteed the perpetual ownership of the land,
the land changed face.
- 115 Property guaranteed: a most effective usage, benefiting all, will
follow from this principle.
- 116 Happiness of a population arises from the enjoyment of territorial
wealth.
- 116 Peoples of ancient Italy; their happiness, before slavery had led to
dishonoring work.
- 118 Happiness of the peasants who are now owners. Why the peasant
buys land at any cost.
- 119 Happiness of the Swiss peasants; farmer owners in the Canton of
Bern.
- 120 Not all owners should be ploughmen; why it is necessary for there
to be rich people.
- 121 It takes rich people scattered in the countryside, for their advantage
and for everyone's.
- 121 The rich must not combine inheritances; neither of the poor nor
of other rich.
- 122 We are only looking here for guiding principles, not set laws on
inheritances.
- 123 What had been done in the feudal system to maintain independence
of inheritances.
- 124 The attention of the legislator must above all be fixed on the poor
farmer.
- 125 The oppression of peasants is more cruel under several masters
than under one alone.
- 125 The fellah, only happy if he can pay the 'miri'; the Indian ryot, a
kind of sharecropper.
- 126 Oppressed because he has no rich landowner as his neighbor.
- 127 Servitude of the Slavic farmer; cultivation by the condition of
drudgery.
- 127 Oppression of the farmer under the Germanic conquerors, his
outright slavery under Charlemagne.

Page

- 128 Feudalism; enfranchisement of the peasants, services and perpetual royalties.
- 129 Origin of sharecroppers and farmers; all their contracts, now made valid only temporary.
- 130 Growing greed; slavery introduced to the colonies; the proletarians in Europe.
- 130 Agronomists recommend large farms; ten farmers are chased out for a consolidation into one.

8

- 131 Chrematistics sacrifices happiness of the poor, even life, for the benefit of gentleman farmers
- 132 Woe the peasants sent away from the fields to the cities.
- 133 A small-hold farmer, as associated with the property, stops the inordinate increase of a population.
- 133 Large farms neglect the necessary balance between consumption and production.
- 134 In other systems, farmers' consumption is unaffected by market hazards.
- 135 Rich farmers supply wheat to the market which is to feed the whole nation; including those working for them.
- 136 Conflicting interests in the grain trade arising from big farms.
- 136 The rich farmer condemns the day laborer to idleness in the dead seasons.
- 137 He renounces intelligence and zeal, which cannot be found in the day laborer.
- 139 Summary of what the legislator must do on behalf of the cultivator.
-
- 140 FOURTH ESSAY – The Condition of the Gaelic Cultivators in Scotland and their Expulsion.
-
- 140 Chrematistics teaches that wealth increases by earning more or by spending less.
- 141 It therefore recommends the saving of labor, or the sacrifice of man to wealth.
- 142 According to this principle, carried to its limit, colonists think to be entitled to the slavery of the negro.
- 142 Similar to a manufacturer replacing man with water or steam power.
- 143 The growing scope of the market has obscured the effects of these savings on men.
- 143 But in the agricultural industry, every saving in labor decreases the number of peasants working.
- 144 Wealth must be sacrificed if necessary in order to have men live.
- 144 To save labor is to cut off not only workers, but consumers as well.
- 145 Example of labor saving on a larger scale; a dismissal of peasants.

Page

- 146 State of the Gaelic nation, at the time when its people were driven from their homes because of savings to be made.
- 147 Statement made by order of the Marquise of Stafford regarding the 'displacement' of fifteen thousand of her vassals.
- 148 Examination of the chrematistic principles of which this revolution is an application.
- 149 Ancient military organization of the Gaels in Scotland; small-hold royalties.
- 150 The lord's power, as head of the clan, was replaced by that of the regimental captain.

9

- 150 Introduction of luxury in Scotland; the ruin of working at home.
- 152 Rural products were suitable for local consumption, not for trade.
- 152 1811-1820 fifteen thousand inhabitants of Scotland were driven from their homes by their seigneur.
- 153 The Lord of Sutherland, once having taken their fields from the peasants; ceded to them, payable by royalties, an area of barren seashore.
- 153 Three thousand families replaced by twenty-nine farms, and by a million sheep.
- 154 Progress of Sutherland turned desert, under a commercial report.
- 155 What happened to the evicted families: emigrants, fishermen.
- 156 The Scottish nobles and the Pasha of Egypt act on the same principle.
- 157 The entire population exposed to suffer from the vices or the whims of the lord.
- 158 Similarity as well as contrast between the slave trade and the expulsion of white people.
- 158 English jurists confused the political power of the lords with that of property.
- 159 On the continent, the law has always protected farmers by having made them de jure owners.
- 160 The Gael was originally co-owner with his captain or with his clan.
- 161 The captain only distributed lots of land to maintain discipline.
- 162 By a secret usurpation, invariable rent in perpetuity was changed into unlimited property rights to the lords.
- 163 The legislator must intervene to protect the people against his lord.
- 164 If the nobles believe that they no longer need the people, the latter will believe that they no longer need them.
- 165 FIFTH ESSAY – The Condition of Irish Farmers and the Causes of their Distress.
- 165 Frightful growth of proletarians; the greatest danger that threatens society.

Page

- 165 This increase first drew our attention to the sovereignty of the majority.
- 166 Tendency of chrematistics to have only capitalists and proletarians in the nation.
- 167 The day laborers of the fields, or the proletarians of agriculture, are generally still small in number.
- 168 But in a system of large farms, all the work in the fields is done by day laborers.
- 169 The same cause produced the expulsion of the Scots, the famine of the Irish, the slavery of negroes.

10

- 170 Pictures of Ireland in 1834, from the voyage of H.D. Inglis.
- 171 The suffering of the Irish comes from the fact that it is a nation of proletarians.
- 171 Work is offered in Ireland at ever growing discounts, and for insufficient subsistence.
- 172 Manner in which Mr. Inglis studies the condition of the people; his itinerary.
- 174 Picturesque beauty of Ireland contrasted with the misery of its inhabitants.
- 175 The destitution and misery of the shacks in County Wicklow.
- 176 The wives and children of the workers are reduced to absolute idleness.
- 177 Peasants of the Barony of Forth, infamous for their indecent state of poverty.
- 179 They even see their condition still worsen with each generation.
- 179 Excessive prices of potatoes, the result of competition between a starving people.
- 180 This competition is the cause of multiplying crimes in Ireland.
- 181 Magnificence of the manors, next to the misery of the shacks.
- 181 Extreme poverty in Thomastown, County Kilkenny.
- 183 Cruelty of the lords who further aggravate this misery.
- 183 The lord's manor is the only market for the poor in Ireland.
- 184 The taste for luxury and the improvidence of the lords increase the suffering of their cultivators.
- 185 Strange assertion of the school which claims that 'absenteeism' does not cause damage.
- 186 Ruin caused by the absence of Lord Kingston; the harshness of Lord Limerick.
- 187 Appalling misery in the suburbs of Limerick.
- 189 The social order is atrocious in Ireland, and needs to be reformed.
- 189 The right of the poor to be well nourished by their work must come before the right of the rich to the surplus.
- 190 The condition of the poor all over Ireland, and as part of the British Empire, has its reaction on the poor Englishman.

Page

- 191 The efforts of charity, to correct such serious rights abuses, can only be palliative.
- 192 SIXTH ESSAY – The Condition of Cultivators in Tuscany.
- 192 The need to study local facts to learn what works, why, and how.
- 193 We ourselves have studied the condition of the Tuscans in detail.
- 194 Similarities and contrasts between the Tuscan peasants and the Irish ones.
- 194 Under miserable soil conditions, the Tuscan catches a great deal of happiness.
- 196 Three classes of cultivators in Tuscany.
- 197 The ‘affittuari’ are not much different from farmers. The immense advantage of the condition of the ‘livellari’ is that they are plowing themselves.
- 198 But those who assumed ‘livelli’ out of speculation are owners in debt.
- 199 The ‘livello’ makes the peasant an owner without stripping him of his small capital.

- 200 The ‘mezzaiuoli’ or sharecroppers, this is the most numerous and important class.
- 200 All sharecroppers in each region are subject to the same conditions.
- 201 The sharecropper barely trades, except with the land; he buys and sells very little.
- 202 How the perpetual association with property makes him study his land carefully.
- 203 The sharecropper has no interest in lawsuits, he has no quarrel with anyone.
- 204 Riant styling and convenience aspects of sharecroppers’ houses in the Nievole valley.
- 204 Furnishings of a farmer's house.
- 205 Trousseau from the wife of a poor sharecropper.
- 206 Work of a sharecropper's wife and children; plenty of white goods.
- 207 The variety, the freedom, and the hope, make the work of the sharecropper appealing.
- 208 Calendar of the Tuscan sharecropper, work for each month of the year.
- 208 Intelligence and skill called upon to support the strength of the body.
- 209 Country celebrations interspersed with work; the ‘battitura’.
- 210 Recreation provided to the peasant by markets and religious festivals.
- 211 The Tuscan peasant is sober, but his food is healthy and varied.

Page	
212	Menu of his meals in the various seasons.
213	Summary of the peasant's physical pleasures; his sensitivity to the beauty of nature.
214	Intellectual pleasures; how much he benefits from reading.
214	What part does religion occupy in the development of his mind?
215	There is no dialect in Tuscany; the peasant's taste for poetry and theater.
216	What is true about the accusation of prejudice and ignorance.
216	Perfection to which agriculture has risen in the hands of the peasants of the valley of Nievole.
218	Influence of the sharecroppers' condition on wealthy landowners; their number.
219	Political causes which have reduced the number of owners in the countryside.
219	How high war prices overexcited agriculture, and then cluttered up the markets.
220	Luxury brought by foreigners to Italy: another cause of ruin for owners.
221	The owners have tried to increase the land's net proceeds, the sharecroppers are opposed.
222	This obstacle is the salvation of the country, which needs to remain the way it is.
222	How much the consumption of sharecroppers promotes commerce.
223	Tuscany provides abundantly for all its needs financially.
224	Extent of government spending without oppressive taxes and borrowing.

224	The Tuscans can correct abuses, but for them to imitate doesn't improve anything.
225	Creation of new land intended for cultivation by sharecroppers.
226	The "plugs" or fillings of the marshes fertilize the lowlands.
226	'Colmate di montagna' the fertilization of arid mountains.
227	Further development of this invention by the Marquis Ridolfi.
228	Meleto Institute to train agricultural engineers.
230	SEVENTH ESSAY – Duties of the Sovereign towards the Irish Farmers, and the Means to Rescue them from their Distress.
230	Terrible moral state to which Ireland is reduced by misery.
231	Continuous danger to the rich, because of "extortive rents".
232	Both owners and proletarians can only be saved by limiting the right to property.
233	Right of the legislator to regulate the conditions of the cultivation contract.
234	It is in the interest of the rich, as much as their duty, to set limits on

their abuses.

Page

- 235 Bravery of the Irish; the nobility protected by the respect of the people alone.
- 236 Ancient relations between the nobleman and the peasant; abundance assured in return for obedience.
- 236 The rent of the land paid in services, according to the custom of the manor.
- 237 The lord always absolute, sometimes cruel, but never was greedy.
- 238 Ireland, conquered in 1172, nevertheless remained subject to the lords.
- 238 Conquest of Cromwell and confiscations which abolished the old customs of the manors.
- 239 The peasants became 'tenants at will', but their condition did not immediately change.
- 240 It took a hundred and eighty years to reduce the peasants to having to dispute the meagerest food.
- 241 Its exports are increasing because of the nation consuming almost nothing itself.
- 242 Ireland has to be liberated from its overabundant population, and all that rests must be associated with property rights.
- 242 Large-scale emigration and filling the bogs within the interior are necessary.
- 243 Huge expanse of open land in Canada for emigrations.
- 244 Colonization must be carried out in small batches, by cultivators, not capitalists.
- 245 Success of all the ancient colonies which produced to consume, not to sell.
- 246 Emigration, hope for the future, can never bring immediate relief.
- 247 Great resources that Ireland can find in the desiccation of its bogs.

13

- 248 In advancing capital, England must impose conditions on Irish lords.
- 249 The right of the farmer to live on the fruits of his labor precedes all other rights.
- 249 The interest of the country demands that the cultivator has a right in perpetuity to the land he works on.
- 250 The peace of society is never better guaranteed than by peasant owners.
- 251 Elsewhere the serfs have become vassals, in England the villains became farmers.
- 252 At the end of their lease the farmers may well be ruined in spite of their improvements to the land.
- 253 To guarantee the Irishman's existence, he must be made keeper in perpetuity.
- 254 Examples of the success of emphyteutic leases are everywhere, even in Ireland.

Page

- 255 The rich and the poor must all have perpetual rights.
255 To the rich the estates they exploit, to the poor those loaded with rents.
256 The rent is to be set by the public authority, not by competition.
257 The extent of emphyteusis should never exceed the capacity of a single family.
258 All family members must work, and to have work in all seasons.
259 Ireland's customs must be given time to adjust to this new order.
260 Accustom the Irishman to regard his present misery as shameful.
260 Legislate obstacles to early marriages.
261 Encourage all habits which honor the virtue of foresight.
- 262 EIGHTH ESSAY – Effects of Slavery on Humanity.
- 262 Purpose of political economy: ensure the ease of all; intellectual development of all.
263 Slavery, on the contrary, is the spoilation of some for the gain of others.
264 As soon as we confuse national wealth with net profit, we sacrifice the poor.
264 The three expedients invented to rob the poor all turn against the rich.
265 Reasons for giving the analysis of Mr. Comte's treatise on slavery.
266 Most of the nations following Christianity allow slavery.
268 Slavery can maintain the strength and poise of the master stock.
268 But quickly degenerates the enslaved peoples.
269 It teaches masters to despise work, and makes them incapable of it.
270 By stupefying slaves, it reduces the value of their labor.
270 The intelligence of the masters is weakening also, because they no longer need to know how to persuade.
- 14
- 271 Slave masters study their equals, but not things nor nature.
271 Slavery stops all intellectual development of slaves.
272 Inability of slaves for any work which requires skill.
273 Effects of slavery on the middle class; it atrophies that class.
274 Effects of slavery on the morals of masters and slaves.
274 Necessity of atrocious punishments for slaves, to whom death is a deliverance.
276 Family link breakage; the white father leaves his mulatto son in slavery.
277 Slave abuse increases as the soil is richer.
277 Slavery is more atrocious as the masters enjoy more freedom.
279 Progress of all the colonies happens in the inverse ratio to the number of their slaves.
279 The children of free men exposed to be stolen and sold for slaves.

Page

- 279 Since the multiplication of mulattoes, the danger has been steadily increasing for whites.
- 281 Slave labor costs the master more than wage labor.
- 282 There are far fewer rich people accumulating, wherever slavery exists.
- 282 Strength, separated from skill, intelligence, and morality, creates little wealth.
- 283 In the slave states: deplorable agriculture, zero trades, indebted planters.
- 284 Slavery drives a free country towards political despotism.
- 285 It puts the independence of nations in perpetual danger.
- 285 Summary of the disastrous effects of slavery.
-
- 287 NINTH ESSAY – How to Emancipate Negro Cultivators.
- 287 Happiness to which country life is susceptible; misfortune of almost all cultivators.
- 288 Misery of the agricultural proletarians, greater misery of slaves.
- 289 The time is approaching when slavery will necessarily have to be abolished.
- 289 The legislator must desire the comfort of the cultivators and that of the owners.
- 290 In the colonies, the owners, the cultivators, and the industrialists, are all overdue in ease.
- 291 This suffering stems from the fact that bonded labor is the most expensive of all.
- 292 They say cane culture demands slavery, but its sweets are lost.
- 292 Manumission does not provide agriculture with a proper worker.
- 293 Breaking the chains of the negro is meaningless if one doesn't make him a peasant.

- 294 It is necessary for the happiness of the negro, for the peace of society, for the profit of planters.
- 295 This benefit must be conferred on the planters in spite of themselves; because their believes are an illusion.
- 295 Slavery brings them no profit, but it flatters their passions.
- 296 Questions that the legislator must study in greater depth, by elevating negroes to the condition of peasants.
- 297 Various conditions of the peasants; the serf with work sharing.
- 298 It can be a penal condition for the rebellious negro.
- 299 Which is suitable for colonies, a peasant farmer or a sharecropper.
- 299 The nature of the culture and the state of the population require sharecroppers.
- 300 The negro, being without capital, could not be a farmer.
- 301 The English counted for their emancipation on farmers whom they

could not find.

Page

- 303 The whites of the colonies do not have the qualities required in a farmer.
- 304 The owner is ruined if he manages his plantation like a farm.
- 304 A deplorable condition to which simple daily negroes would be reduced.
- 305 France must accomplish the work begun, and make the negro a peasant.
- 306 But it must now give up, to making this peasant an owner.
- 307 There is in slavery a quasi-contract which founds rights as well as obligations.
- 308 The master exercised at the same time contract law and political power.
- 308 We must abolish political power and convert useful law to benefit both the cultivator and the owner.
- 308 The plantation must be divided into smallholdings between the slaves who cultivate.
- 310 Culture will henceforth be intended for consumption rather than for export.
- 310 The administration alone can judge precautionary details in a final execution.
- 311 Our best wishes for the negroes and for the cultivators of all races.

END OF THE ANALYTICAL INDEX

i

PREFACE

Perhaps no century as much as ours has witnessed men, as gathered in society, directing their thoughts towards theory and as to how conditions all hang together. Instead of continuing to submit themselves to what they found was already established, only because it appeared to them that way, they forthwith wanted to know the underlying reason for everything. Thus they questioned the power that produces entitlements; and they sought to secure, in the name of human nature – enjoyments, compensations, and rights, as its creator had intended. While work showed itself to them as the nurturer of human beings; they wanted to acknowledge how the fruits of this work were distributed, and according to what involved principles – accumulated wealth was formed. In turn they submitted their beliefs to the same analysis; and they judged their religion according to its philosophy and morality. And finally they consulted history, to elucidate by the experience of the human race the theories towards which these arose. So they searched in politics – their rights in the creation of wealth and their enjoyments; in moral philosophy – their duties; and in history – their experiences. Such has been the path of the social sciences, as it has been traveled for these last sixty years or so by the human race, with an actively intensified curiosity.

During these same sixty years I too have been the dally of the revolutions produced by the agitation of these same social issues. I suffered from it in my person and in my fortune. I have seen popular passions up close, and I did not seek to remain as an outsider myself. I joined the whole fray and applied to it all the thinking that I was capable of; while being subject to

ii

the experiences that I underwent, sometimes in spite of myself, about the events which I was bearing witness to. I got to know life and customs, like the language of different nations, living among foreigners; and, not being endowed with any power, I tried at least to exert some influence on them through my writings. Since almost forty years, in fact, I have generally been taking part in all social-science discussions; while, in long books about history, I tried to revive the experiences of the past. I have published in periodicals and in freestanding collections, more than sixty papers on issues that bother me, and which I thought to be important. In them I have alternately considered constitutional politics and political economy; the fair claim to rights of peoples oppressed, both regionally and by race, and all ultimately due to a reigning moral philosophy. These writings, almost always provoked by the circumstances of the times, were then perhaps put in the spotlight of a novel truth; but they all carried at least the character of deeply held convictions.

Several of my friends have often asked me to gather these publications that were once disseminated in academic journals of various countries; especially, since it was impossible for them to do the collecting as such by themselves. I have had myself, I must admit, a great desire to collect these fleeting pages; wherein I thought to have come up with the principles of a new science. I had fought for humanity to become exposed to the truth; and it seemed to me to be contrary to my constitution, to withdraw from this struggle as long as I felt that no young successor had come to take my place, to defend what I believed to be the correct principles. On the one hand, although in a long career I had not changed my mind very much and it did seem that a single doctrine had recognizably emanated from my many bits of writings, and feeling as well that my ideas were cleared up providing closure through experience and study. On the other however, I

iii

no longer was satisfied with my original works myself, and agreed that the public had a right to to be even less satisfied; insofar it could ask me about not what I thought once, but what I thought today. And that it would reject as having become irrelevant, everything that would have lead to a coming about only because of past circumstances; even if it were not to dismiss with disdain a reprint of those fleeting pages, and the mixed-up messages of this author's existing oeuvre, therein.

What to do though? I am well advanced in years to undertake composing a large new work from all those dispersed pieces. Nevertheless I will try,

but, rather than setting about doing a complete rewrite, I'm offering to do so by reproducing their intent in the form of independent Essays. Each of those will have their separate interpretation of what it will be about, its independent introduction, and thus as such it will be open to critiques of various repetitions; but this undeniable inconvenience is also redeemed by a benefit. I know only too well that the time has passed when the authors of serious books could also count on serious, attentive, and perseverant readers; where they could confidently expect that the deduction of their reasoning was followed from the first to the last page. I am only too aware of impatience, with which we run on a terrain that we think we already know; and the reigning opinion of readers, that it is enough for them to simply leaf through the pages in order to understand, and then judge as to whether to accept the subject or not. So I feel the need to return to the truths several times, and in new forms on truths that I believe to be most fundamental; because if I gathered them all within the same chapter, if I presented them as the elements of a science as such, I have reason to believe that it would be precisely this chapter, precisely these elements, that the reader would dispense with to read. Besides, I am convinced that we have fallen into serious errors, for always having wanted to generalize everything that relates to the social sciences. And that to the contrary, in order to study the human condition it is the surrounding details that are of the essence. As such it is necessary

iv

to be attached sometimes to a time, sometimes to a country, sometimes to a profession, to interpret correctly what man is, and how institutions act on him. Those who, on the contrary, strove to see human activities isolated from the world, or rather who considered human activities in a changing of its conditions in the abstract, have always arrived at conclusions that were contradicted by empirical evidence. So it seemed obvious to me that it would have weakened my work if I had cut off the distinguishing marks that contributed the most in rendering it practical, and which may also be the ones most likely to hold the reader's attention. On the other hand, by forming a collection of these Essays, not in the order of their original composition, but in that of the ideas contained therein, each of them was taken separately as an underpinning – that I have added to, shortened, and modified without any scruples. I have looked at this book as any other one of mine, because the public would only with some difficulty be coming to a different conclusion. I therefore reconnected lines of thought to again be pursued or abandoned at long intervals of time. I have filled in gaps by altogether new essays, almost as numerous as those I have reproduced. And finally, I tried to complete, as much as my strengths would allow, the exposition of those sciences which seem to me to be the most important of all, for the happiness of mankind.

By putting my writing hand to work, I soon recognized that the task was more difficult and took even longer than I had thought. Also, relying little on what time I have left and such destinies, I have avoided, by publishing the first volume of these Studies, to announce what I set out to do. The

editing of the second volume gave me a little more confidence. By now I have reached half, or at least one third of my work; so, if life is not given to me to continue it to the end, and each volume having a special purpose, the work should not be considered incomplete, even though it was cut short.

v

Each volume, true enough, is far from exhaustive regarding the vast subjects to which it is devoted, or to have considered them in all their facets. Also, I only announce studies on the still open questions that I tried to clear up; and, while each of those essays will satisfy a reader's curiosity, their collective, even without understanding all the science, will at least point to a generating of ideas from which it must flow. The first volume, or 'Studies on the Constitutions of Free Peoples', was intended to exhibit what seems to me to be true liberalism as opposed to democracy, which is dominating these days among theorists, and a kind of obscurantism, which dominates in practical businessmen. With the first, I do not recognize any rights to sovereignty, other than that of the founded nation itself; but it is the sovereignty of intelligence that I invoke, and not that of any material force or number. It is the sovereignty of a perpetual as well as enlightened will; and I set out to establish how all should compete, and when and why some should resist. How all rights and all sentiments had to have their own mechanisms, so that the national intellect could ripen, purify itself, and calm down, before pronouncing its judgments. I have at the same time considered mankind, as it is, almost everywhere deprived of its freedom and rights. I tried to impart a sense of why it was unlikely to improve its condition through revolutions, and tried to outline the course of gradual process by which it could make itself proud, enlightened, collecting more virtues, more freedom, and more happiness.

The second volume as well as the third are intended for studies on political economy. I got particularly interested in exposing the theory that deals with the distribution of wealth, this in contrast to the chrematistic school as only dealing with its formation. Work engenders all material pleasures of men. From work – wealth comes into existence; and a true political economy must teach by means of communal and residential rules how

vi

to regulate human work so that all have a share in the pleasures it will be providing; that all are fed, housed, and dressed so as to enjoy the blessings that the Creator has in store for man; that all have enough leisure time to maintain the health of the soul as well as that of the body; that all are drawn, at least to some extent, to partake in the spread of intelligence; that some, lucked out by fortune, find in wealth the leisure, independence, and ambition, which are necessary for developing the highest faculties of the soul and the spirit; that some may advance towards the arts, towards the sciences, towards the virtues, all of which make human societies glorious; that these privileged men, these men who will be rich, for the greater good

of all, are numerous enough so that their example be advantageous for all; let them be like yeast which makes the mass expand, or like a light which illuminates its surroundings; that their residences in the capital, the cities, and the countryside, the degree of their wealth and its proportion to the rest of the population, are regulated in such a way that it results in the greatest possible good for society; and that it's always for society's mutual benefit that, according to the intention of Providence, the poor and the rich encounter each other's presence.

These constitutional and economic studies, at least to my understanding, are more analogous than we are accustomed to recognize. One just like the other, aim for the greatest good of society, its happiness and its progress; both deviate from their objective task when, considering society abstractly, they would lose from view any of the components that this society is composed of; whether this is human beings, its institutions, or things. The legislator, the administrator, the jurist, all must endeavor to secure the greatest good for all.

vii

It is according to this fundamental idea that, in the constitutional studies of the first volume, we first wondered if not all had an equal right to make up the common will; but soon recognized that the advantage of all would be limiting the rights of all; that the greatest good for society and all its members could only be achieved as long as society is directed by a wise, just and enlightened, constant will; that this will would not be the result of the wish of the majority, because in the latter case all votes are counted as equal, while among the members of society, no equality of faculties, will, attention and interest, exists.

viii

Thus a single thought is directing us in the various parts of this work. It is the search for the greatest good as benefiting the human race; of which this greater good always includes within itself – a striving for honor with moral perfection. Also, only one rule is used to classify men's rights and claims; which is – society being formed for the greater good of all. It is from this goal that all the rights of its members stem, and it is this goal that alters or modifies their original equality. All men, without doubt, are born equal in rights, but all have renounced this equality of rights for their common benefit. The equal sharing of political rights, by way of universal suffrage, would produce, instead of an expression of the national will, that of ignorance and dumb laughs; the equal division of goods would give to all instead of universal bondage – misery and barbarism. Also, the first wish of all hasn't been to seek equal rights policies, but the wisdom of national councils; while the second wish was to seek – not a fully equal sharing of acquired wealth, but the guarantee that its social works will be continuing, and that its fruits will spread abundance everywhere. Thus everyone agreed that others might be richer than themselves, because it has been shown to them that they would still be remaining richer than they

would be after an equal sharing. And so the rights of all those who rise above an original equality are based on the advantage that they bestow on society granting this preeminence.

The first of the political-economy volumes that I publish today is almost entirely filled with studies about territorial wealth and the condition of the farmers; the second will be about studies on commercial wealth, and the condition of the city dweller. Neither one nor the other will exhaust the subject; it is large enough for one to devote an entire lifetime to it. I only got

ix

involved with putting before the eyes of my readers – special observations, studies about the human condition in various countries. I clarified these facts, before raising them myself to be generally valid considerations. I pointed out and described evil circumstances, before seeking a remedy. And I only regret not presenting yet more studies on the condition of the farmer in the various countries; as they would be useful for the progress of political-economic science and the well-being of mankind. Among the Essays that make up this volume, three had appeared, in whole or in part, in the ‘Revue encyclopédique’, in September 1821, May 1824, and July 1827; one, in the “Revue d’économie politique”, in May 1835; and finally, one of them, although composed for this work, appeared this summer in the “Universal Library of Geneva”; the others are all still unpublished. It is only after a job that has not yet started, that I will be able to judge what is appropriate to reproduce, from among what I published on the conditions of oppressed peoples, the rights of whom I was trying to claim, either in Europe or in other parts of the world. I’m even less in a state of being able to judge at the moment, if my criticisms of the stories that were happening in my time were indeed worthwhile keeping. I do feel however more of a partiality toward some pieces of moral or religious philosophy, which will find their place in my last volume.

1

INTRODUCTION

The first volume of these Studies was devoted to researching the principles of the political organization of human society. We wondered how men, by uniting themselves for their mutual protection, had to go about enlightening each other on the advantages which they should aim for to achieve; how to make the common light brighter by focusing their individual lights into a single beam; how a national intelligence would thus arise in the midst of all individual abilities to understand, and by what difficult combinations of effort it could be managed to make society dominant; while it would always be either subjugated or lost, if its sovereignty were ceded to a single head, if it were delegated to a small

number of distinguished men, or if it was reserved to the plurality of votes. Thus our first volume was above all intended to research how the national will is formed, how it is illuminated, and how finally it dominates; in this one we propose to study the subject on which it must, before all others, practice. Society owes its primary attention to the

2

guarantee of its material interests, its subsistence, and we want to try to discover which steps it must follow, so that the material goods that labor will create for it, provides or maintains the greatest good to all. This is what, according to the etymology of the word, we call political economy, because it is the law or the rule of the house and community.

Let no one reproach us for lowering human beings to level of the brutes, by, as the first goal of this effort, making the focal point – work, which ensures its subsistence; and, by addressing, above all, society's purely material advantages, we will soon discover that, more than any of our predecessors, we consider political economy in its relationship with the soul and intelligence. Sustenance however holds life, and with life – all moral and intellectual developments to which the human species is ever predisposed. Society must, like the individual, consider above all – bodily health, it must first and foremost provide for its needs and development; because without the vigor that this health provides, without leisure, which begins only after these needs having been met, the health of the soul is an impossibility. From all considerations facts appear, convincing us the way in which society provides for its subsistence at the same time determines for the great majority the misery or the ease of life, as far as – health, vigor of the species, beauty, or its very degeneration is concerned; feelings of sympathy or of jealousy, that make citizens regard themselves as brothers eager to help one another, or as bitter rivals set to destroy each other; finally, activity of the mind that develops when a happy mixture of leisure is available, and to which all progress of intelligence, imagination and taste is due; or, from the annoying languor produced by luxurious wealth in some, the same kind of stupefaction that is affecting others from the abuse of their physical strength and a resulting weariness.

This product of human labor, which with subsistence represents all the material goods that man wishes to enjoy, and almost all intellectual goods that he cannot get a hold of

3

but with the help of the first, was named "wealth". We considered wealth, or the theory of accumulating wealth, as the specific goal of political economy; which as goal is a lot better designated, already from Aristotle's time, by the name of chrematistics. One does not clarify ideas by arguing over the meaning of words, and we would not have produced this one if it hadn't at the same time served to specify the cause of the wrong direction, as this has now been followed by a branch of social science. This science has always and always must have as its object – men, as congregated in a

society. Economy, in the true sense of the word, is the rule of that specific environment; political economy is the rule of the household applied to the community. These are the two great human-made associations, the original associations, which are to become the object of science – everything does proceed from man, everything must relate to man, and to men united by a common link. But wealth is an attribute, so to say, of man and its things. Wealth is a term of comparison, which by itself is meaningless if one does not at the same time specify what it relates to. Wealth however, which is an appreciation of all material things, is an abstraction; and chrematistics, or the science of wealth accumulation, having considered it abstractly and not in relation to man and society, has constructed its edifice on a base that dissipates in the air.

Wealth, we have said, is the product of human labor, which provides man with all the material goods he wants to enjoy; it is the representation of all material pleasures, and even of all the moral pleasures which yield from those. Very well – but for whom? That question should never be lost sight of, while on the contrary it never presents itself to its theorists. For whom? According to the answer that we will give to this question, man himself belongs to wealth; or else, wealth belongs to man.

The Shah of Persia considers himself rich, because he counts as part of his wealth, all the inhabitants of his vast empire; who are his slaves, and all their goods, which he can take from them whenever he wants. Santo Domingo [East Hispaniola] was once called a rich

4

colony, because we only wanted to look at the forty thousand white people who lived there; and thus we counted the four hundred thousand slaves who worked for them as being their personal properties. The cotton trade in England is called a rich trade, because it raises colossal fortunes for the merchants of the Indies in the importing business, for the manufacturers who rework the cotton in immense factories, for the subsequent dealers who distribute cotton over the whole earth. But we don't take any account of the farmer who, by giving birth to cotton, himself remains bonded in slavery or misery; nor of the weaver, who barely satisfies his hunger while he works, or who perishes in hospitals as soon as the work is suspended. From our perspective, to the contrary, we have no qualms to spell it out clearly – national wealth is the participation BY ALL in the advantages of life. No doubt it is in a varying proportion, that the members of society are called upon to share the product of its social work, but we will never call the share of one of its members wealth, while it was taken away from the other.

Everyone believes, at least at first glance, to clearly understand what that wealth, and the effects of wealth on society, comprises; everyone thinks they understand how it modifies the living conditions of the poorest and the richest within it. The more closely one looks however, and no longer is confused by contradictory phenomena, which to a certain extent do indeed counterbalance each other, one no longer is stymied in one's judgment about wealth. One will find that wealth is not an essence but an attribute,

and that its nature changes with the people and things to which it becomes attributed. As a satisfaction of our needs, as the source of our physical enjoyments, the perceptions that we form about wealth are still accurate enough, but as such these admit only very few degrees of variation. To conceive of the increase in wealth when our needs are satisfied, we need to let go of ourselves and consider the value of things, and by the distinction they bear with respect to their markings of the different ranks within our society, or, through the work that was dedicated so as to be able to obtain them; and as such, these two appreciations aren't even commensurable. With our mind floating endlessly from one to the other, we often end up

5

asking ourselves what is real in wealth, and if, after having been enriched, we do not actually remain poorer than before.

All artworks are valued effectively less expensive in rich nations than in poor ones. Also, while we claim to be richer than our ancestors, all goods that are manufactured cost us much less. Is it true therefore, that we have enriched ourselves by having accumulated advantageously? How could we compare, for example, the fabrics in our clothing that have replaced each other over time? How will we conclude, from the expenses dedicated, that we are richer or poorer? As these are satisfying real needs, their usefulness to all is still roughly about the same; but, by having been obtained with less dedicated labor, they are worth less; since they are exchanged for less subsistence, again they are worth less; and considering the point of view from which they mainly flatter the passions of the rich, as constituting a distinction of rank, they are worth even a lot less, for the price of the most magnificent dress is more within the reach of inferior classes than it was at any previous epoch. One can be assured however, that the introduction of a new manufacturing process has enriched the country; that when, with the same work, we create ten times, a hundred times more yards of fabric, we also create ten -, a hundred times more wealth. The question is: how does this wealth become considered as it applies to the needs of society? What becomes of it with respect to the inventory that one could rely on to make a nation wealthy? Does its wealth really lessen as its exchangeable value decreases? And then, what is the real use of all these modern inventions regarding the manufacturing arts, of which we are so proud?

Indeed, we always get lost when we try to consider wealth in the abstract. Wealth is a modification of the human condition; only by bringing it back to human beings is when we can get a clear idea. Wealth is the abundance of things that the labor of man produced, and which humans will next need to consume. The nation that is

6

really rich will be the one where this abundance will provide the most material pleasures to the poor on the one hand, and to the rich on the other. Let's try to get a more precise idea of these needs, these desires, these pleasures of the human species, to which the happiness of societies is so

closely connected. Pleasures of the poor folk are made up of abundance, variety, and food security; sufficiency, in relation to what the climate can produce, and cleanliness of clothing; the convenience and sanitation of their housing, while in the same way entailing the climate and its heating requirements; and finally the assurance, that the future will not be inferior to the present, and that by applying the same work – the poor will obtain always everything in its provision of a similar enjoyment. No nation can be considered prosperous if the plight of the poor, who form a distinct part of it, is not ensured under the four conditions, just listed. The sustenance in such measure is the common right of men, it must be guaranteed to all those who do, whatever they can do, to advance the work to be done; and the nation is all the more prosperous as all individuals provide for a more secure share in the ease of the poor.

The pleasures of the rich comprise above all the satisfaction of the same three needs – as regards to food, clothing, and housing, the same security for the future – in terms of a continual well-being; but they understand there to be a new element – leisure, as well as their sustenance needing to be independent from their work. In the satisfaction of these needs, there is undoubtedly a great deal of latitude: food, clothing, and shelter, can be infinitely better for some than for others. It is not necessary however to be deluded about the pleasures which are attached to the satisfaction of the needs of the richest. These ones are purely sensual, and the theoretician who wants to appreciate the benefits of this kind of wealth for a nation, without denying its purely sensual existence, will not attach much value to them. Other kinds exist solely as forming a distinction, only as giving to whoever is in the possession of them a feeling of his superiority

7

over other creatures. We will not deny that this distinction, and the respect which opulence inspires in the vulgar when he sees it spread out all over a sumptuous table, in fine articles of clothing, magnificent vehicles and teams, or monumental homes, doesn't have any political utility; but as far as considering the happiness of nations, the happiness that wealth provides to the rich, the philosopher will not pay more attention to this enjoyment of vanity than of any sensual enjoyment. To hide his inconsistency, he may put up yet fewer cases of the third prerogative of wealth, as to these needs pertaining to the human species.

But wealth still gives the rich two prerogatives whose applied benefits are reflected throughout society: one, it is to use their leisure time to develop all their intellectual faculties; and the other, to use their superfluities to relieve miseries. It is by these two prerogatives that the rich are necessary for the progress of any nation; while a nation that has no elite, that is to say no men having both their leisure and their superfluity, would quickly fall into ignorance, barbarism, and selfishness. Let there be no illusions about the necessarily mind-numbing consequences of bodily work and its exhaustion. By also calling on all individuals in the nation to deploy their muscular strength, we would not only deprive ourselves of all the progress of the sciences and the fine arts, but of all those of intelligence, taste, wit,

and grace. The human beast could possibly always get fatter in its stables, but he would never become more of the brute he is. Instead his motion onward would always be to move away from a heavenly intelligence. Intellectual progress however, gives rise to new needs among the rich and opens wealth up to new jobs. Intelligence, imagination, sensitivity, as such demand to be satisfied like material needs of the body; while the search for aesthetic beauty, moral beauty, and intellectual beauty, calls for a superfluity of human activity like human input, which could have remained unemployed. Charity is another prerogative of

8

wealth, even more important for society as a whole than for the poor by themselves. It is charity that must repair the accidental disorders which disturb the regular distribution of wealth. But to an even greater extent it is charity that must bind together the ranking classes, substitute affection and gratitude for the struggle of interests; spread the light with its benefits, and make all individuals also participate in the moral superiority acquired by a few; and finally give the nation the consistency of solidarity, that can only be preserved through love among fellow citizens.

To appreciate the influence of the pleasures of the rich on the national happiness, it is necessary to take into account not only their intensity, but also the number of those who participate. If we suppose, that after having provided for the necessities of all, the superfluity of the nation is put in reserve as an endowment to the rich, and that we then ask ourselves in what proportion it is desirable to see it reappear; it is easy to answer first that it is better to make a lot of people happy than a single one; that the one who has a supply of ten portions, sufficient to ensure ease and leisure for ten families, will not be as happy on its own as these ten families would have been. But we will soon recognize also, that for the nation as a whole, for the social purpose of its preeminence, several moderately rich are better than one alone being rich to the point of opulence. If the proper vocation of the rich is above all to put their intelligence to use for the good of all, we also can't forget that the truth is that while work stultifies, luxury irritates; so that the beneficial influence of the rich on society not only decreases with a fall in their number, but also with an increase in their wealth, when this surpasses a certain extent. If indeed the second function of the rich is to bind society together through charity, this will also mean that the more we decrease the number of rich people on earth, the more, by concentrating their heritages and removing their manors, the more they will also be made strangers to the poor that they should be attending; the more we increase distances between them in their residences and the ranking classes, we decrease the links of sympathy with it. So that even if we suppose that the

9

sum of the charities of a single millionaire would be equal to that of ten moderately rich; of the one hundred rich whose heritage would now have

been concentrated into one, their social effect and even their moral effect, would no longer be the same.

After having endeavored to appreciate the benefits of wealth, at its fair value both for the poor and for the rich, we may understand a little better what is the most desirable distribution of wealth, both for the happiness it would engender, and for the moral progress it would bring about. But we have hardly moved forward to be able to judge – what in specific terms enriches a nation, or what impoverishes it; or to recognize which effects become apparent first of all, when an increase in wealth is being exerted on the general prosperity.

The phenomena which we see before our eyes, far from clearing up our doubts, seem likely to increase them still further. Man nowadays has made gigantic progress in industry. With help of the sciences being cultivated in their useful application, he has learned to master the powers of nature, and assisted by previously accumulated wealth as capital, each year he has produced a greater mass of items intended for the enjoyment of the human species. The works of man have multiplied and changed the face of the earth; stores having filled up, we admire in the workshops the powers that man has been able to acquire from wind, water, fire, and steam, to as such accomplish its own works; the genius with which he tamed nature, and the speed with which he is carrying out industrial works, which in the past would have taken centuries. Every city, every nation is full of wealth, each wishing to send its superabundant merchandise to its neighbors. And new discoveries in the sciences allow them to be efficiently transported, despite the immensity of their weight and their volume, and with a speed that is confusing. It is the triumph of chrematistics; never before has the art of producing and accumulating wealth been taken this far. But is it equally the triumph of their political economy? Has the rule of the house and the community provided for the happiness of all its people? The man for whom this wealth is

10

destined, human society whose material pleasures have been accumulating in ease, has it indeed gained in overall secure proportions to this immense development? As a deciding aspect of this question, we believe ourselves to be assured that if as soon as there are more things available as intended for the enjoyments of man, each one will be able to obtain a greater share of the whole. And if this isn't the case, don't bother to put any weight on your answer.

However if we turn our eyes on man and not on the things produced, if we look at the human conditions in detail and the benefits that each can derive from wealth, perhaps a doubt will enter people's minds. When we set out to ask as to whether every man in his environment, is more assured of his subsistence than he was before this great development of industry took place? does he work less and rest more at present? does he have more security for the future? does he enjoy his independence? is he not only better housed, better clothed, and better fed, but did he gain, because of these industrial the developments, more leisure time in which to develop

more aptitude for intellectual pursuits? has the proportion between the various conditions changed to the advantage or to the disadvantage of the many? are those at the lowest rung of the ladder more or less better off than in the past? Is there a greater or lesser degree of inequality than in the past between the poor and the rich, and is it more or less easy to advance in class successively? For example in the countryside, is it the number of day laborers, or that of small sharecroppers, small farmers, inclusive of small landowners, which has increased proportionally? And in the cities, is it the number of day laborers, or the number of masters and journeymen, that of small workshop foremen, that of retailers and wholesalers, that of all intermediaries between the producer and the consumer, which has increased in the same way? Let us get a sense of the importance of all these questions, in terms of the sum of acquired social happiness, about the two different eras discussed, that are up for comparison. Wealth is being realized in enjoyments within the human condition; but to estimate the mass of national enjoyments, it is almost exclusively the number of

11

those who participate in appropriating it that we must stop, because the enjoyment of the rich man does not increase with his riches.

We have infinite difficulty in designing an organization different from ours, and to see a past in which we have not lived. However the only tell tale monuments of countries sometimes speak to us in a language that we cannot refuse to hear. Those around us here, in the place where we are writing this work, do however bring the past to life; and with having the power to present it most clearly to the imagination.

In Italy, from the most opulent city to the least village, there is hardly a house which does not appear to be in the best possible state to the people who live there today, in the same condition as those who had it built; not a single house that is not better than what we could ask for, even in the most prosperous of countries. The superb Genoa, the city of palaces, was raised by commerce. But compared to Paris and London, the modern palaces of commerce, and one could add if wanted those located anywhere in all the districts of England and France; we won't find even one as large as those adorning this one city; we won't find any that have the same awesome greatness of magnificence. The opulence of merchants these days, has neither a past nor a future; so it does not raise any visible monuments. Only one of the republics of Italy therefore, seems to possess more rich merchants than the two empires that today hold the scepter of commerce. But the palaces of the merchants of Venice, Florence, Bologna, Sienna, are rivaling those of Genoa in magnificence; while the palaces of the military nobility adorning Milan, Turin, Naples, Piacenza, Modena and Ferrara, are more impressive than those adorning Paris or London.

Let's put our sights lower down, let's get into the smaller towns. The very one near which we now live, Pescia, enjoys, with a rare exception, all the prosperity of modern industry; we have seen it rise, within our time, as becoming one of Italy's greatest industrial fortunes. But what strikes us, here in Pescia, more than the opulence of the newly

rich, are the palaces (that's what they are called), of the urban nobility. Pescia is a city of four thousand souls, and there are more than forty of these palaces, which, for the dignity of the architecture, the size of the rooms, the nobility of entrance stairs, the vast expanse of the apartments, could be compared to the hotels which the highest aristocracy in France occupies in Paris. It is true that the interiors no longer respond to the magnificence of the original drawings; on the contrary, the owners of the majority find it difficult to keep them going; the furniture has disappeared, the frescoes are degraded, and the families often retreated to the least imposing of these vast apartments; but doesn't their original construction speak loud enough? doesn't it say that once there was a time when men of average fortune but independent were much more numerous here than they are today, and that these men had a taste for grandeur and beauty more than they have today in the most prosperous countries in Europe? Let us descend even further from this condition. By placing oneself in a high place, near this same town of Pescia, the eye embraces with a single glance, within a radius of eight to ten miles, twelve or fifteen of these villages closed by walls, which the Italians call 'castelli'. This word cognates with that of castle, as it indicates a fortified place, and as it is associated with ideas of resistance and independence. But it differs from this, just as the guarantee of civility in life differed in the Middle Ages between France and Italy. The castle in France was the residence of a single man, who was once free in the countryside; of a gentleman who, behind his moat and walls, protected himself from oppression; the 'castello', in Italy, was the residence of free men from the countryside, who joined together in mutual defense; free men who had surrounded their home with an enclosure in common, and who had sworn to run to the sound of the same bell, to push back the same enemies. Let us enter these 'castelli'; for the most part they are in ruins, and there are hardly more than twenty to thirty houses still intact. But the strong and solid walls of these still livable homes,

with three and four floors, have withstood war for five centuries as well as the insults of time. In general they are no longer inhabited but on a single floor; those who hide their humble households there seem embarrassed by all the space wherein they see themselves lost. These houses had been built by men of a condition far superior to those who inhabit them today. They represent a whole order of men who no longer exist in society. They aren't to be found in England, France, Holland; the countries where riches seems so abound with all their workshops, all their taverns; no more than in Italy. These men, of a slim, but independent complexion, worked with their hands to gather the fruits of their fields and their vines; but they did not share them with anyone. They relied on their own influence to run the boards of their communes, and if necessary, on their own sword to defend them. They felt so assured of the stability of their fortune, and that of their

children, that they wanted the houses that they built would last forever. The valley of Nievole where all these 'castelli' spring up around Pescia, their small capital, isn't any bigger than the domain of many a British peer, on which we see only the stately mansion of the lord, about twenty large farms, and perhaps a few hundred day laborers' cottages (1). We probably do not find in any other country the traces of such great past prosperity; just as we do not see, in any of those who are thriving today, such great a spread of happiness. Nowhere do we see, in proportion to the size and the population, so many moderate but independent fortunes; and beside them so many colossal fortunes, in the hands of people who proved not only that they had the power of wealth creating, but moreover the love of beauty which ennobles its use. This fact is a very important one; for the Italians, who were so rich,

(1) The surface of the valley of Nievole is equivalent to 158,000 English acres; the Duke of Sutherland's estate in Scotland covers one million acres.

14

did not have those powers over nature that applied science has given us nowadays, they didn't produce, nor create, this wealth with a speed that confuses our modern workshops.

The monuments of architecture can give us an idea about the wealth of the cities of other times, or, of any of the class of men who had leisure as well as a superfluity. But what would be especially important for good political economy would be to know the modal condition of the poor, to make sure whether, as long as they worked, society made them find plenty of it and thus security. In general, dwellings of the common man do not resist the insults of time for centuries; his clothes, and his food, last that much less again. Almost no ancient author has bothered to let us know these vulgar goings-on of his time, as that did not arouse his interests. Moreover, the political condition of each country was constantly complicating the purely chrematistic results; oppression, anarchy, war, often came to strike the lower ranks of society; and their effects should not be confused with that of a lack in the original wealth-generating processes. It is not impossible, however, to perhaps collect in the historical accounts of the middle ages, the features which were let escape by chance; and which, without giving us a complete picture of the lower orders of society, are enough to make us understand how much their state of affairs differed from what is common today.

Since the end of true feudalism, ever since the lord no longer needed the peasant to defend him in his private wars, the largest and most oppressed class of the nation was that of the villains, who by themselves carried out all the work of agriculture. Their condition was not everywhere the same, in France and in Germany the number of serfs tilling the soil was small. Others owed their lords or priests a tithe of 10%, and to their bishops or overlords another 1% by way of the royalties or cences, as well as bodily services; to the king the poll tax and the corvée, which deprived them of most of the net revenue from their lands, but these lands were supposed to

be theirs. The fixed poll tax, which was an entirely arbitrary imposition, was regulated according to their apparent wealth, such as

15

their teams, and farming train. It also ensured the peasants to be even more miserable than they already were; and if they were not satisfied with their housing, clothing, food, all of the coarsest and most repulsive kind, at least try to hide carefully from their masters that could indicate some ease. The house they inhabited, the land they cultivated, remained theirs and their children's. In this respect, the very fund of their fortune was not without guarantee; but they had none of its revenue. Time after time, the lord and the agents of the tax authorities robbed them of the fruits that they had watered from their sweats, and reduced them to a most appalling distress. This was not all: the king's troops were sent to their homes, as into free quarters, or often they violently moved themselves into them and against government orders. So not only the did the soldier come to eat the soup of the peasant, but he forced him to to kill the ox of the plowing team. Often he stripped him, and overwhelmed him with blows to extract a ransom; and we see in the notebooks of the States of Languedoc, during the reigns of Henry III and Henry IV, that these outrages were destroying a large number of peasant families, and that the number of active chimneys in the country was rapidly decreasing.

One could not think without shuddering about such oppression; so much insecurity, so much violence, so much misfortune, which were to spread the seeds of hatred that erupted during the Revolution. The peasant, who made the nation alive, himself felt that he was not assured the right to live. Society recognized him as a property and did not guarantee life to him. Constantly joined to the feeling of misery was that of injustice. Because it was by violence, by arbitrariness, that he was deprived at all times of what he rightfully believed to be his. But we must not confuse, in the real-life condition of the peasant of the old regime – his political oppression with chrematistic oppression. As a citizen, the peasant had no guarantees; as a plowman however, he would not have been that badly off. After paying the tithe, the cense, and the regular taxes to the king, he would have been left enough for keeping

16

himself in relative abundance; and indeed it is only because he was generally superfluous, that he could be subjected to these extraordinary extorsions.

We cannot send troops to live at will with the negroes of the colonies, with the Irish farmer, with the English cottager, nor with the day laborer of any country; that is, among the proletariat. The latter consists of men for which we have calculated just what it takes to have him work and not die. Every day his daily sustenance is allocated to him; by an extraordinary extortion therefore one could well take his life. There would not be anything else that the quartered soldier at his home could rob him off.

In despotic states rights are not respected; here, might makes right. But the inhabitants of even the poorest cities, were not entirely deprived of power. Their very title of bourgeois, in its German etymology, meant a banding together; as in coming up for one another. They had indeed united to defend themselves, to do justice. They knew well that the nobility hated them, despised them, but that it feared them nonetheless. The city had privileges and bourgeois magistrates who rendered justice, and this overarching association was divided into a number of smaller associations; guilds, corporations that looked after the interests of their members, and who, if necessary, knew how to defend them with sword in hand. The more an anarchy was generally reigning, the more powerful the bourgeois corporations were and knew how to get themselves respected. That they sometimes succumbed is true. But then woe to the vanquished; for the conqueror united the cupidity and ferocity of the brigand to the jealousy and resentment of the gentleman. The cities of Flanders and those of the bishopric of Liège put this to the test under the domination of the House of Burgundy. It was then that the freedom and security of the bourgeoisie ended. The government has since become steadier, but less just. The merchant and the worker both, were humiliated, deceived, and ridiculed by the sovereign who made them work and did not pay them. The city guilds were powers in their own right, and the king did not want to leave any other power than his own, standing; which didn't

cease until withered away by the Revolution, that finally suppressed it. The esprit-des-corps is always jealous and exclusive. The bourgeoisies and their guilds wanted justice, freedom, equality for themselves; but they did not extend these outlooks on the whole nation. Jealous of their privileges, they were reluctant to share them with others. They closed as much as they could any free entry into their trades; they repelled the inhabitants of the countryside who wanted to become citizens. They worsened the conditions of trade apprenticeships; and did not grant mastery, other than with great difficulty. While on the other hand, they wanted just as much as the overarching bourgeois, that all masters were equal; and they did not allow a single master to have under him a great number of workmen. In many of its occupations they limited it to a single apprentice and just a single journeyman, and thus they succeeded in keeping the towns' industries greatly inferior, as to the number of hands they employed; but also in a great superiority, with respect to the rewards they granted, as compared to industries of the countryside.

The bourgeois had thus extended the power of monopoly over as many trades as were carried out, and reaping the benefits of these monopolies to the disadvantage of their fellow citizens. That is to say – by ensuring the producing and merchandising of goods to be scarce, they were able to sell them dearly and with great profits; putting little zeal into the improvement of those goods, assured in the fact that they would always find a market for them anyway.

They never competed with each other, they never ever sold at a low price, they never lowered wages because of a lack of competition; and, since they had no poor except for those, in small numbers, whom an accident had put out of commission; those unfortunate, they supported themselves. Each trade had its budget, and rarely resorted to hospitals. The latter were founded by charitable men, and were sufficient for the needs of the whole population. The number of beds in them, to be found proportional to the need of a city in a given generation, was equally proportionate to the need of the following generation. Until the Revolution it had never been noticed that,

18

with the ministrations of charity, poor people would be created. This system, as considered in relation to things, and as relative to the creation of wealth according to the rules of chrematistics, undoubtedly was bad. It created enduring obstacles in the midst of and simultaneous to abundance, betterment, and a well-faring market. But from the perspective of people, had all its effects been calculated correctly by destroying them? It powerfully contained the rural population, always eagerly seeking to better themselves in the cities. And yet, city folk lost their freedom, their happiness, and their health. It placed an almost insurmountable obstacle, to a healthy proportional growth of the industrial population. For the number of masters was limited, and no worker could marry until he became a master; it maintained equality between masters, ensuring both independence and mediocrity to each – instead of allowing one, gathering in his workshop hundreds of workers, and engulfing the industry with efficiency an excellence. It assured anyone entering an industrial career sufficient sustenance as soon as he began to work productively, a steady but slow progress towards comfortability, a state of being that insured both himself and his family when he arrived at middle age. Indeed, the historical evidence is not lacking for demonstrating that the industrial professions, throughout the Middle Ages and until the fall of the old regime, were always amply paid. Great ease reigned among craftsmen. Historians, so fixated on wars; and so brief, so ignorant on all the other phenomena in the life of nations; never made the bourgeoisie center-stage of their studies except during public calamities. Those were for instance the tumult of the 'Ciompi', which was staged by the poorest artisans of Florence; the domination of the two Artevelde and the quarrel of the white chaperones, which introduce us to those of Flanders; and then the civil wars of Burgundians and Armagnacs, and especially the League, which initiate us among all the orders of the bourgeoisie in France. It is after reading the memoirs of these stormy times, that we remain convinced in the praiseworthiness of

19

the good bourgeois society; masters in professions which are less honored nowadays; of a hereditary ease which was preserved in their families, the

richness of their clothes which had to be constrained by sumptuary laws; finally, of the liberal wage that work always drew to itself and of the near certainty that workers felt in being well received as well as well paid in another town, when a violent uprising was chasing them out of their own. So what is the real goal of human society – is it to dazzle the eyes by an immense production of useful or elegant things; gaining an understanding of astonishing dominion that man exerts over nature, and by the precision or speed with which inanimate entities perform a human-like work? Is it to cover the sea with vessels and the earth with railways, which distribute in all possible directions the products of an ever more active industry? or is it perhaps to give to a couple or three individuals among every hundred thousand the power to dispose of an opulence that would be enough to put these same hundred thousand fully at ease? Regarding this, we undoubtedly have made an immense progress in comparison with our ancestors; we are rich in inventions, rich in mobilities, rich in scientifically applied power, and especially rich in commodities; so all the people not only could be rich for themselves, but all their neighbors could be so too. But if the goal that society had to set for itself would be promoting full employment, and guaranteeing that its fruits would arise from ensuring the development of man and of all men, rather than any of those listed above; that these fruits from human labor, which we call riches, are to be spread with a beneficent hand, although in different proportions, over the whole society; if these fruits, which include moral and intellectual goods as well as material ones, are to be a means of betterment as well as enjoyment, it is for certain that we have reached our goal. And is it not also sure, that in seeking such wealth, we have not forgotten the order and rule of the house and the community – political economy? In all the military monarchies of Europe, property was poorly protected, just as bad as all the other rights of

20

citizens; while that of the weak was not protected at all. The goods of rural poor peasants, urban poor craftsmen, were exposed to annoyances, insults, which no longer are known to us today except in the despotic monarchies of the East. It is not this state of violence, the result of a detestable political organization, that makes it necessary to evaluate the remuneration that appeared from the carried-out work. As was seen previously, the lowest order among the inhabitants of the countryside, the cultivators, were in general owners. And while it is true that they were charged with royalties, the latter would yet have left them with a surplus, if often the plunder of the powerful had not taken it from them. The lowest order among the inhabitants of cities, the apprentices and companions, were in general well dressed, well fed, and well accommodated in the house of the master with whom they worked; and they were sure, by their assiduity, to become masters in turn and then find themselves for the rest of their life free from want.

The order that we substituted for this one, and that the chrematistic school

considers as its triumph, is based on an altogether different principle. This school pursues the increase in wealth in an abstract way, without raising the question in whose favor this wealth should be accumulated; instead advising nations on how to produce the largest possible quantity of work at the lowest cost. Wealth, they are saying, is the product of useful labor that is not yet consumed, and which accumulates on earth. This wealth accumulates in two ways, by producing more, or by spending less. Each member of society wants to get rich, each is therefore striving either to increase its production or to reduce spending; everyone thus tends to their own goal, common to human society. Let all these individual actions be allowed to flourish; so that, far from hampering men, or their production, or their economy, we, on the contrary, will arouse competition between them. A universal competition, that also holds true among all conditions and between all men in the same condition; and we will see the nation's wealth increase, either by increases in production,

or in a reduction of costs, with an activity that past centuries couldn't even dream about. In chrematistics therefore, or in fact all those who nowadays are making a name for themselves in political economy, a theory is being espoused and held to be true by all industrialists and contractors of works of all kinds; elicit speeches by the latter in favor of the indefinite freedom of trade and industry, in favor of the fiercest competition, which could be translated as follows: "Seek your interest before all; whether to sell or to work, you will find your own interest to be preferred to your rivals' interest; you will find it preferable to make the most lucrative conditions that you can with those who want to serve you, either it's about buying from them or making them work for you. Perhaps this will thus reduce them to misery, perhaps you will ruin them, perhaps you will destroy their health or their life. It's not your business – you foremost represent the interest of consumers; but since everyone is a consumer at their turn, you therefore represent the interest of all – the national interest. Also, do not listen to any mitigating consideration, so that pity doesn't stop you; as you may well be called to say to your rivals: your death is our life". This language no doubt will seem harsh, but it is not any more harsh than the conduct of rivals throughout Europe called by this new doctrine to replace each other – to destroy each other. Two actions, also encouraged by chrematistics, began wherever free play has been granted to individual interests. On the one hand, we wanted to create more wealth, more of those things that work accomplishes, and that man desires to consume. Now, as these things do not become wealth until they find the consumer who agrees to buy and to make use of them, and, since their needs did not necessarily increase with production, each manufacturer sought to take the place of his rival, so as to take away his buyers. Nations compete with each other for production, thereby attaching their glory. If the French can sell their goods in a foreign market hitherto reserved for the English, or

if the English can on the contrary exclude the French, one as well as the other will applaud and ask for the applause of their compatriots; as having made not only a good investment, but having done patriotic work as well. However the one who takes a market away from the manufacturer who used to supply it, the one who cuts down the rival manufacturer so as to not being able to sell, condemns the manufacturer to bankruptcy and will have his workers starving.

The same rivalry exists from city to city within the same empire, it exists from workshop to workshop in the same town. Everywhere too it is a war to the death. It involves the ruin of industrialists and even mortality among their subordinates; it reverses as many fortunes as it raises; and the branch of commerce which thrives the most is probably the very same one in which, generally, there would be the most bankruptcies occurring, for the new fortunes could have only been raised by the reversal of old fortunes. In fact, before the introduction of indiscriminate competition, the renown of manufactures was set in stone; the name of any big manufacturer was like a title of nobility that was transmitted with pride to their descendants; today anything established long ago acquires mistrust and a prognosis of imminent ruin; now there are only beginners engaging in entrepreneurship, go-getters, who know how to under-sell their rivals.

But if everyone works to increase their own production, each also works to produce cheaper, and one of these actions is the necessary consequence, the complement of the other. But wealth, as we have said, is the fruit of applied labor; therefore savings in production costs cannot be something other than saving on the amount of labor employed to produce, or the cut-down on the reward of that labor.

Indeed, from one end to the other of countries where free competition is accommodated, everyone is excited; the dominant thought of whoever undertakes productive work, of whoever does the paying, is doing more things now with the same amount of human labor, or as many things with a lesser quantity of human labor; or, get human labor for a smaller reward. However, whenever we get one or the other of the first two economies, we inevitably also get the third, because on the labor market one rejects those

superabundant hands which are forced to present themselves at a discount. Examining all that we have been calling progress – in the building arts, in factories, in agriculture; we will find that any discovery, any improvement always boils down to doing more with the same effort, or as much with less effort; and that all progress thus tends to reduce the value and reward of labor, or the ease of those who only have their work to live by.

Let us remember what we said before about the previous state of society. There was undoubtedly, especially under despotic governments, a lot of misery and a lot of oppression for the lower classes. But these lower classes, although they lived from their applied effort, they did not only live

off their work; they were associated with prosperity too, they themselves reaped the benefits of all discoveries, and they gained as much from the progress of their industry as they lost through a slighter evaluation of their physical strength. The peasant, the villain, mistreated and despised as he was, was yet an owner; any progress in agriculture was good for him and also a way to save on work, because the spade is a tool, the plow is a tool, and harnessed oxen do human work; but he was careful not to use any equipment, even the simplest, if it did not result in either more output or more rest; however, despite the savings that each progress in his field did accrue to him as far his work was concerned, he still had to do all his work by himself.

If the villain had a property in the fields, the industrialist had one too, but better guaranteed by his corporation, as its executive. All the works of the towns without exception, were accomplished with the aid of tools; more or less simple, more or less complicated machines, than manual work done by man in motion alone. But the men operating these tools were limited, their number could not increase without them giving operating instructions to any newcomers Having no conflict to endure with a

24

rival industry, no competitors to under-sell, they probably were very reluctant to do research in new mechanical inventions that would enable them to accomplish in eight hours the work that they previously needed twelve hours to do; they only thought about those things when a new need arose, like when a new market opened up for them. Indeed, the regulations of all the old masterpieces were conservative; to maintain skills as they are. It seems they were put in place expressly for preventing any new paths to be taken. The industrial arts however, also did make a slow progress under the former conditions, but these never reacted against man, never attacked the worker by reducing his compensation.

The fundamental change which has taken place in society, in the midst of the universal struggle created by competition and by the immediate effects of this struggle, is the introduction of a proletarian identity among human circumstances in the modern age; the proletarian, whose name – borrowed from the Romans is ancient, but whose existence is altogether new.

The proletarians, in the Roman republic, were men without possessions, who paid no taxes to any authority, and who were only attached to the country by the offspring (proles) they created; because the Romans had observed as we do nowadays, that those who give themselves no concern to raising them, have the most numerous families, despite of not owning a thing. Besides, the Roman proletarian did not work; because, in a society which condones slavery, work is dishonorable for free men. Proletarians lived almost entirely at the expense of society; from distributed provisions which the republic made freely available to them. You could almost say however, that modern society lives at the expense of the proletarian; from the share that it takes away from the reward the proletariat extract from having worked.

The proletarian alone, in fact, that is according to the chrematistic order, has to remain responsible for all the work done in society; he must also be foreign to any property, and not live beyond his wage. Society, according to the chrematistic school, divides itself into three classes of people – as to their wealth producing involvement; to wit: landowners, capitalists, and the day laborers or proletarians. The first provide the land, the second the management, and the third the workforce. In return, the first receives rents or lease fees, the second profits, and the third wages;

25

each of them strives to retain as much of the total product as he can, and their reciprocal struggle settles the proportion between rent, profit, and wages.

The abolition of medieval corporations or guilds, with all their privileges, created the first proletarians, the day laborers in every town. Each one of them could now enter any profession, and leave it to choose another one; each one could offer, to whomever wanted to use it, his body and living quarters; each, without apprenticeship, without admission to a guild, without a shop to work or trade, could work on the capital provided by others, in the company of others, before needing to have accumulated anything; and all believed to have gained freedom by losing a guarantee. In the beginning, the workers, the proletarians, only existed in small numbers, and as in exceptional situations, were employed in the skilled trades; but soon they multiplied by the causes which we are going to expose, as all the old masters, journeymen, and apprentices, disappeared almost absolutely, and proletarians nowadays are carrying out just about all the work done in the cities.

The revolution that occurred in the countryside or in agriculture however, has not been so sudden. The cultivators, far removed from losing any part of their ease, had on the contrary enough reason to view the suppression of feudal rights as an improvement; those who were owners, leaseholders, and sharecroppers, continued to unify their interests with the ploughmen's – the right in property being neutralized. Farmers, though only in those countries culturally advanced, began to find it suitable for them to restrict themselves to directing work instead of working themselves; to as such resemble manufacturing entrepreneurs, and to have the work they needed carried out done by agricultural proletarians, whom they hired and fired according to whatever was convenient to them. The economic revolution that replaced the erstwhile peasants by agricultural proletarians has so far only been accomplished in England, but we can say that it has already started to raise its ugly head everywhere. We see a few more instances everywhere daily – their number is increasing, while that of the peasant

26

owners is decreasing. The peasant is the farmer who tends the land, which has its inheritance right, and so maintains his share in that land; the day laborer does not care about his daily involvement, it is the latter who is

irrelevant to a country's wealth; the first aspires to perpetuity, the second is without a past and without a future.

In the pursuit of inexpensive manufacturing, the chrematistics school recognized as a matter of principle, that in the division of a given force there was always an inherent loss; that the capitals which represent a strength, in the creation of wealth, they are applied the more usefully the more they are united; that a hundred thousand ecus in one single enterprise accomplishes more work than ten times ten thousand ecus in ten different enterprises; that there are savings to be had on the construction of large machines, on their lifespan, on their maintenance, on accounting, on inspection; and that, the more wealth is accumulated in reserve, the more cheaply work that needs to be undertaken can be carried out. During the same time this principle was recognized in theory, has it been continually enforced by self-interest; and in its application, which has been making compromises with the ancient order untenable, pushed all those that it was driving from the latter into the ranks of the proletariat, so as to increase their number daily. This principle, in fact, which digs an abyss between extreme opulence and extreme poverty, applies to all industries equally; and from everywhere it goes after that happy independence, that happy mediocrity, which for so long was the object of the wishes of wise men. According to English economists, there are many more savings to be had and much more profit to be gained by practicing agriculture on large rather than on small farms.

The inspection of works is easier, less time is lost to move from one to the other; the farmer; a master over a considerable amount of capital will be in receipt of a commensurate education, having shown both intelligence and studiousness; all its buildings, tools, cattle, are better and more durable; there will be less of a hurry to sell, so that its markets will tend to be more advantageous to it. Indeed, wherever large farmers have found themselves in competition

with the small ones, they have ruined them. The English landowners have withdrawn their leases from them, knocking down their living quarters, converting their flower and vegetable gardens into fields, meadows, and orchards. And when they are looking for a small farm, to study it so as to make it disappear, any of them that are less than half a mile or 320 acres in extent will do. The whole mile is 640 square acres, and many farms, in the more prosperous counties like East Lothian outside of Edinburgh for instance, are more than two miles in extent.

A farmer at the head of a business, if it's a considerable one, doesn't work with his hands; he has all the pretensions and manners of a gentleman; all the work is done for him by the proletarian, by the day laborer, who is no longer a man, but a thing, in the estimation of his superiors; who compares him equally to the plowing oxen, and the machines – in that either one of the three is fit for the choosing of a working instrument from which the most product with the least expense can be extracted.

By having pursued this alleged improvement in agriculture, we have obtained a saving of applied human input that the chrematistic school finds admirable. All the agricultural work of England, the area of which is estimated at 34,250,000 acres, was accomplished in 1831, by 1,055,982 cultivators, and it's hoped to be feasible to reduce the latter number even further. Not only were all the small farmers reduced to the condition of day laborers, but a still larger number of day laborers were forced to give up work in the fields; because, as we are assured, a lot of labor in the small farm system was lost through efficiencies of scale; work, which isn't any longer lost today. But will an urban industry be able to employ the families sent back from fields to the city? will it be able to feed them? Did we ever think through, the proportion that necessarily must exist between products that arise from the soil and those from urban industries? And when we see, in some exceptional country, artisans indeed as numerous as common laborers elsewhere – do we not recognize that these artisans are numerous there only because they supply works of art to the whole world? By the way, urban industry in general has adopted the principles of the chrematistic school with more vigor yet than even those reigning in the countryside. In England it is only by the immensity of capital that manufactures can thrive. It is only when they have enormous amounts of credit at their fingertips that chrematistic principles can come into their

28

own, like a reliance on – economies of scale; powerful and durable machines; inspection and supervision of workers; and finally in research, office, and sales staff. The large factories in competition with small workshops, in all markets, have an advantage proportional to their size. Indeed, the industrial shops that worked on a budget of a thousand pounds sterling were the first to disappear from England. While even today in France, to the contrary, the greatest number of manufacturers is still working on a budget that does not surpass this sum, or about 25,000 francs. Already, those in England who were working with 10,000 pounds sterling (250,000 francs) have been considered too small, were ruined, and have given way to the big ones; today those who work over 100,000 pounds sterling are estimated as being about average, and the time may not be far off when only those will be able to compete that have the capacity to work on a budget of a million sterling. Every time the largest capitals merge and a new factory arises, as work accelerates concentrating in a unified direction; so that we can see coming out of the same factory building, the fabric made with what twenty-four hours previously was a fleece on the back of a living sheep, the theorists of the chrematistic school utter cries of joy and admiration. The prosperity of a country is considered heightened – when one man can each day load some vessel with clothes, or instruments, or iron, or pottery, or whatever; which could well be enough for several thousands of his fellow men; but what a worrisome moral defect of the human species, not bothering to ask itself even once of what ever became of all these men that were displaced by that great new factory? Because all the consumers it is providing were

formerly neither without clothes, nor without tools, nor without pottery; but they got their supplies from those hundreds of small manufacturers who lived once happily and independently in their midst, but who have disappeared now making way for a millionaire lord of the mercantile world.

29

The capitalists are on the lookout to find the means to concentrate all their industries in the same way; abolishing trades everywhere, to make way for workshops. They're striving to manufacture all the pieces of smithery, millwork, and carpentry in their factories. The chrematistic school is in awe of the flour sifters of the Gironde, which makes the millers useless; similarly about the barrel factories of the Loire, which make coopers useless. And the same goes for steamboat and railway companies; each usurping: horse-drawn and sailing barges, omnibuses and the stagecoach, which with the help of immense capital replaced all the petty industries of boatmen, valets, and independent carters.

Each of the latter had a small capital, and he was a master in what he did; unlike in big companies, where all the work the is done by hired people, proletarians. The same admiration erupted when opulent retail merchants opened their huge stores in the major capitals, wherein they're offering, using the newly invented rapids means of transport to supply very close to home, all consumers to the ends of every empire. They are on their way to do away with all wholesalers, all retailers, all the small shopkeepers who populate the provinces, while they will replace these independent men with clerks, hired men, proletarians. Will we then not ever notice that in the name of wealth and the economy we're just chasing man from place to place? It ought to be proven by now that in every instant, and time and again, such action is highly detrimental. Would it really take a change of language to persuade nations that by economy they should cease to exist? Just as by the power of big capital nations have attacked all independent industries, and forced the man who was previously a master in a trade to descend to the rank of day laborer, proletarian, the new authorities have also been attacking all the domestic work done by the lower-class family branches; and again supported by the arguments centering around the power of money and the seduction of the cheap as promulgated by the chrematistic school.

Why, the latter proclaimed, should the housewife spin, weave,

30

and do all the family laundry? All this work could be done infinitely more cheaply in the factory; with much less money, the housewife would have more as well as finer fabrics. Why would she bake her own bread? As she could never make it so airy, as baked to perfection, nor so cheap as the baker. Why does she prepare by herself the evening hot meal? A large-scale establishment, with provisions made in advance, a considerable amount of capital, and quality control from start to finish would provide

the family with better food; saving both time and heating expenses. Mobile kitchens can even bring them their hot soup every day to their door.

Why? - Because reciprocal care and duties form and strengthen domestic ties; because the housewife makes herself dearly felt in a poor family by solicitude with which she provides for their primal needs; because love for the laborer is often only a brutal and fleeting passion; but his affection, for the one who every day prepares for him the only enjoyment he gets to obtain daily, is also increasing by the day. It is the housewife who foresees and remembers, in the midst of this life so relentlessly driven by work and physical needs; it is she who knows how to blend – economy, propriety, and order, with abundance of spirit.

It is in the happiness that she gives that she finds strength; to resist, if necessary, the imperious demands of drunkenness and gluttony. When we no longer leave to women, another role in the house than that of making children; won't we believe that we will not have upset the sacred bond of marriage, more than by the lessons or the examples of an immorality of the most condemnable order?

Among the nations which one calls the most prosperous, the manufactures prevailed however; over the independent trades as well as domestic works. Their successes were announced as a prodigious conquest of the industry; and the writers as well as leaders of the chrematistic school congratulated each other on the rapid increase of public wealth. But a scary reality has come to

31

suddenly disturb the atmosphere, and upset all the principles that had been announced in such a dogmatic fashion: it is the appearance of 'pauperism', its rapid and threatening increase, and the admission by the oracles of the chrematistics school that they felt powerless to remedy it. 'Pauperism' is a calamity that first made itself felt in England, and which still has no other name than that given to it by the English; even though it is beginning to visit all the other industrial countries too.

"Pauperism" is the state to which the proletarians are necessarily reduced when they lack work. It is the condition of men who have no choice but to live off their labor, which they can only do as long as capitalists employ them, and when in idleness must fall back on society. This society, set up in such a way that all its support accrues to the rich, does not allow the proletarian to work the land; if the owner or his leaseholder does not call him to. It does not allow him to work in the trades if the manufacturer or his deputy do not call him. Now some and others have studied ways to save on human labor, so as to make it useless; because each advance that they make in agriculture or industry, will allow them to dismiss a certain number of proletarians, and condemn those to an idleness which would mean the death for them, if society did not assist them. Justice and humanitarianism also proclaim the necessity of 'legal charity', or of a provision made by a social authority in favor of the poor whose frightful agony would at least be somewhat less painful. No society believed in

refusing this legal charity, but it is only quite recently, one could even say today, that experience and careful consideration have also demonstrated the powerlessness of society to bear such a burden. Taxes in favor of the poor increase their misery, their dependence on financial support, and their vices. While at the same time it would be sufficient to lift them out of their poverty only insofar as it would absorb all the net revenue of the richest nations.

However, what has become of this opulence, so long since foretold? Where exactly is this progress towards prosperity that we have been

32

invited to admire? Ever since nations got richer, they are they no longer able to feed themselves? By forgetting men for things, by relentlessly multiplying material wealth, have we not done anything else but thereby create the poor? By arousing everyone to seek their own advantage, at the expense of all those with whom one associates with, have we not reached a point where, instead of achieving a maximum of all individual strengths, that for each, by himself, no doubt is achievable, but to the disadvantage of all when the combined action is considered? It is true that we said this a long time ago already, but writings aren't very impressive when these are attacking a system as dominant as chrematistics is. The facts are more obstinate and more rebellious however; my adversaries try unsuccessfully to refute them without recognizing them as facts, as if these only were mere writings of mine. But this doesn't mean they represent them less. To the contrary, they grow bigger often even just for having been neglected, and then they fall back with all their weightiness on the most skillfully constructed theory, crushing and overthrowing it the moment its author is congratulating himself on having victoriously refuted all his adversaries. These are also the facts that we are proposing to collect here in this work. Instead of exposing a new theory altogether; these are the facts, as they relate to man and not to wealth; these are the various conditions of society that we propose to study, in appreciation of the happiness provision of each condition. And not only in terms of meeting physical needs, but also regarding that of man's tastes and inclinations; from the perspective of his intellectual and moral developments which arise from daily life. Our goal is indeed to determine – what should be the rule upholding society, as far as its material interests are concerned, so as to its subsistence. But instead of looking for the latter in abstract notions about real value or price, we will only appreciate wealth itself – in the resonance it has with happiness as part of man's moral dignity. Therefore we flatter ourselves that we can finally come to know how much in the way of pleasure or sufferings are attached to each condition; how much intellectual development society allows each class to develop; and how much each modification of political economy's social order, is worthy of praise or blame.

FIRST ESSAY

Balancing Consumption with Production.

The industrial world, the world as considered from the perspective of its economic aspects, has undergone revolutions in the last sixty years, no less surprising than the political world experienced. It hasn't changed face any less; it doesn't present to the observer less novel questions; it doesn't call for less of discussion – relating to experience, or of maxims that had been included among the number of the theory's principles. Long ago, during the middle ages and until the time of our fathers, greed was probably no less than it is today. Everyone also aspired to get rich, because wealth, then like today, gave access to all the material pleasures. But then, all who had some power, aspired to enrich themselves by appropriating the fruits of the industry of others, and not by producing wealth themselves. A universal prejudice had attached the idea of a degradation to all lucrative work; or to all the use that man would put his hands to, to help himself.

The work in the fields was abandoned to the villains, to the pot-carrying men; whom drudgery degraded, to unmercifully be taken advantage of. The work of the workshops, in the cities, was considered by the gentlemen as no less abject; even though the bourgeois, by self-associating for a common defense, had succeeded in engendering fear among the nobility and occupy a higher rank in the State than farmers. The act of buying and selling was also looked upon in shame, and a gentleman could not enter that trade either without derogating himself. There was a lot less shame in begging and especially to steal, than to earn a living by working. While the feudal system was in full force, the lord, fortified in his castle, believed in his right to wage war on all mankind; to rob passers-by, subject travelers to exorbitant tolls, and hold to ransom everyone else's merchants. Later, it is true, when a central government had forced all its wayward lords, while still sovereigns of their of own fortresses, to return to an obedience fold – it also constrained them into respecting a bit more public order and that of foreign property temporarily in their domains. From then on forward, the gentlemen believed that they had no way left to reach a fortune other than by war. Their compensation did not enrich them; but they lived in freedom in their country, even among the peasant or the bourgeois, and they congratulated themselves on having 'gained' a lot, for as soon as entering the enemy country in the service of their overlord, they were allowed to pillage.

The valet was reputed to be much superior to the industrialist; most began their life of service as domestic servants. They then sought to advance themselves preferably into the courts with pensions, the gifts of kings, or finally as game managers; where the resources, on which they relied, were to meet their expenses.

In the seventeenth century, when war was subject to slightly more humane laws, so that the opportunities to 'gain' by the war became rarer, the poor gentlemen found themselves without resources. Then prejudice began to relax in their favor; some were allowed to plow their own fields, resting their swords on their plows;

35

for others, to work in glassworks, because there, at least they did not live by the work of their hands, but with their breath, and as "glass gentlemen", taking up the sword on Sunday, preserved in extreme poverty all the pride of their nobility. But it wasn't just the class in possession of all territorial property, the nobility hereditarily devoted to the cause of carrying arms, whom partiality to peace condemned to idleness; all those who got rich in finances, in magistracies of all kinds; all those who rose in the literate professions, the doctors, the lawyers and judges; all those for whom the heritage of a clergyman brought about independence, all those who made their fortune in commerce or manufactures, aspired to the highest social status, or the aristocracy; they bought charges from the king that raised them above the third estate, and at the same time they renounced any sort of lucrative occupation. Although repelled by the old aristocracy, who always yet reproached them for the 'servile works' of their fathers, they tried to prove that they, at least, 'lived nobly', that is to say without doing anything. Even before being ennobled, they endeavored, as soon as they could, to escape the need, to erase from their shields the ignominy of work, and to prove that they were born to destroy, and not to create wealth.

At the same time that all the rich considered a degradation, any part that they would have taken personally in any industry, another opinion, then sanctioned by religion, forbade them to contribute with their capital. According to the interpretation given to the laws of the Hebrews, any loan at interest was qualified as usury; all scrupulous men refrained from advancing any funds to as such take part in any profitable business. Yes some put themselves above the warnings of their confessors, or threats from the courts, and lent to usury; but they did so in secret, at large interest and through black-market middlemen, rather than by legitimate companies. Only governments have reserved for themselves the faculty of borrowing; they alone have given existence to the small, often deceived and deprived class of rentiers.

36

In fact, it was so difficult to take advantage of capital that there wasn't much temptation to accumulate it. If one didn't intend the fruit of one's savings to buy land or pay charges to the king with, it was kept in a strongbox, it was buried, or it was dispersed as it went. These customs, which seem so far removed from ours, still represent themselves to us alive in the comedies and in the novels about the reigns of Louis XIV and Louis XV. Father Prevost represents himself therein as a prime example of

a gentleman not budgeting to live; if destitute, depending only on favors of the king, on the hunt, sometimes on theft or scam, however never on work, which he rejected as an ignominy.

In the course of over sixty years he operated in public opinion, with regard to labor and industry, an even more complete revolution than that which later changed political rights. Since then he apparently has been knighted in some way. Soon, in fact, when the aristocracy of France saw themselves proscribed and emigrated, they made it a point of honor to live by the work of their hands, rather than beg for help; putting into practice the lessons which they had applauded during the reigns of Louis XV and Louis XVI. Their examples succeeded in overturning a prejudice that reason had already shaken, and the nourishing arts of mankind resumed their rightful place. Without a doubt rich men still have and will always have an aversion to rough and tiring work, but it is no longer because of being afraid of derogating themselves that they refuse it. They like their ease, their rest, all the pleasures of life. It's not that they don't want a job that would deprive them of it, but they do not in any way refuse to gain. They greedily accept any participation in industries which won't deprive them of their enjoyments.

The wealthy industrialists, the merchants, the manufacturers, won't in any way renounce their industry by receiving honor certificates from nobility, entering the council of kings or the peerage of free nations;

37

and they are even more careful not to withdraw their fortune from it. Personal labor, especially the muscular labor of the rich and the noble men, doubtlessly would not add much to the general production from the industry of mankind; but the work of all their wealth, of all the capital they lend to industry, adds to the powers of man in a way that looks miraculous. The first of the lessons of political economy is that capital is the engine of work, and that no work can be accomplished if no capital is advanced to put it into activity; if it does not provide the raw materials, the tools, and the maintenance of the worker, while the job is running. And that the more capital accumulates within the hands of those who intend it for industry, the more work is performed.

As Adam Smith discovered and revealed to the world the true principles of political economy, capital was still so disproportionate to the work that was required, that in his eyes the most desirable thing for a nation was to accumulate capital, and that the most profitable industry seemed to be the one that made capital circulate the quickest. But it was precisely the time of transition, the time when work ceased to be a shame to become an honor; the time when the church ceased to declare its anathemas against loans at interest. Nowadays all the capital of the rich is put at the service of industry; this capital has not ceased to increase because of the constant efforts of all men to grow ever richer. At the same time, multiplying again the energy of this first engine of any manufacture, by ingenious processes such as the institution of banks and improvements in credit, were put into effect to further activate the circulation and use it entirely to bring more

work about. Nobody still confuses usury with the loan at interest, and there is no longer anyone who has any misgivings to lend to a merchant, or to buy a stock in a trading company. It is not only by their activity or their vigilance,

38

and by the use of all their fortune, that the rich and the well-born have assisted these servile works, this creation of riches which they once regarded as some sort of dishonor. Their brightest men have since worked to enslave nature by making use all the inherently natural forces, that the study of physics helped them discover, to support the labor of man. During the times that prejudice, condemning work as degrading, was reigning in all its force – physicists, naturalists, and mathematicians, all claimed to cultivate their science only for selfish theoretical reasons. They would have been ashamed to assign a use to these noble daughters of the Muses. Looking themselves for the properties of matter or the properties of numbers; at most they would sometimes allow themselves to apply this knowledge to public works or to the maintenance of health. But still, the chemist would have been rejecting with all his might, being mistaken for the apothecary; and the same would go for the mechanician, descending to the trade of the watchmaker. Science could only be cultivated by those who had received a liberal academic education; and all those would have thought they were degrading themselves by putting themselves at the service of those who did servile works. But today, faculty chairs are founded in all universities for chemistry, physics, mechanics, and as applied to the industrial arts; all such practical scholars pride themselves as justifying the usefulness of their work and discoveries – showing the use that can be made to facilitate all industries, to enrich markets and provide pleasures to consumers. Men of great name and great fortune have even turned their mind's activity, and all the power and credit which they enjoyed, to a more immediate application. They wanted, out of a sense of patriotism, to help create wealth. They studied in foreign countries, more advanced in the arts of agriculture and manufacturing, to introduce these applications to their own country. They offered bonuses and rewards for all discoveries applicable to work; they bought the secrets of the industry, not solely to practice them, but to make them universally available; they made themselves famous, by founding and directing workshops and factories in places where no one had ever thought to establish, as no

39

interest had called for them before. And finally, they pursued the art of enriching themselves not with greed, but somehow with a patriotic disinterestedness.

Already the progress of civilization had guaranteed to everyone, in almost all of Europe, the enjoyment of wealth and the fruits of labor. All the most difficult steps in the sciences were done; it was only a matter of finding the right application now.

After a long war, bitterly fought and universal, peace condemned a host of formerly active men to seek a new career, a new livelihood, and the means to repair all the destruction caused by public calamities. A considerable number of men vowed all at once to dedicate themselves to the sciences, with the intention of applying them to industry. Their progress was further accelerated by emulation, and through rapid communications, that were established between them throughout Europe, even throughout the known world; and by the fame which was attached to their discoveries, which increased as the human mind is loath to ineffectual applications.

Also, in the last quarter of a century, the natural sciences were seen as taking gigantic steps, so much so that it confused the imagination of just about everyone. About as soon however as a great scientific discovery is hatched in a brain, it will find its useful application in some industry. It's no longer like it used to be – isolated experiences, almost underground industries, which grow and prosper through someone applying one of the mysteries of science. All these men of talent, and in all ranks of society no doubt, are on the lookout for such discoveries to be made; with the activity that distinguishes our century, the early application to some profitable industry. The inventor knows in advance that the more his enterprise will be conducted on a large scale, the more that considerably larger profits are to be made; so he immediately looks on the capital market, to capitalize the industry that he is proposing to create. Capital today, is overflowing throughout Europe; the interest rate has fallen successively

40

and further decreases are expected; banks of lending and stock buying are eager to promote any new industry; funds that no private fortune could raise are advanced by anonymous finance companies. The capitalists are so embarrassingly eager to find profitable employment for their money, that they have been seen rushing with blindness and with fury, millions after millions into canal-building enterprises, in those of mines, in the loans of the new American republics, and especially today in the railroads. Distance no longer is an object for speculators; the hope of to be gained profit quickly circulates capital from one end of the known universe to the other end. No industry which offers a profit is arrested in its development from a lack of funds, on whatever gigantic scale that it is conceived. And it's not just in a single place that it is carried out, in as much as twenty different countries we see that the new industry will be born at the same time. Soon too, like the giants born from the teeth of the dragon sown into the earth, we see them, already from the moment of their birth, fight fiercely against each other.

Work, the father of all production, sixty years ago was still lacking to the needs of the world. Neither the workers' hands nor the capital, nor applied science, was sufficient for creating consumer demand; also, although the industry was despised by the powers that be, it was amply rewarded. There were poor, even many of them; because convulsions in society, private extorsions, often left no food to the one who had earned it by the sweat of his brow. But otherwise there was no poor man who, by working, was not

certain to find enough to live on; no capital was devoted to an industry that did not return an expected profit; no commerce, that, with however limited intelligence but diligently and thriftily carried out, did not lead to wealth. It was only during the reign of Louis XV, that all moralists were finally seen to agree that work ought to be encouraged and laziness stigmatized. In that same era, philosophers began to deal with the question of wealth formation. They informed society that it came about entirely through work; they identified capital as the entity putting this work in motion; they recommended to use capital preferably in the trade of merchandise where the circulation of it was the fastest,

41

so that it could put more work in motion. At last, they called with all their wishes for production, which seemed to them identical with the creation of wealth, and at the time they were absolutely right.

But we well remember hearing a famous story in our childhood, that in the days of enchantments, Gandalin, who was lodging a sorcerer in his house, noticed that he took a broomstick every morning, and that by saying a few magical words, he turned it into a water carrier that immediately went out to the river, and retrieving as many buckets of water out of it for him as he wanted. Gandalin, the next morning, hid behind a door, and giving his full attention, he caught the magical words that the sorcerer had spoken so as to make the enchantment; later however, he could not hear those he then said to undo it. As soon as the wizard went out, Gandalin repeated the experiment; he took the broomstick, he uttered the mysterious words, and the water-carrying broomstick left for the river and returned with his load, he returned and came again, a second, a third time; already, Gandalin's tank was full and water was now flooding his apartment. It is enough, he cried, stop; but the machine man did not see and heard nothing; insensitive and indefatigable, he would have carried all the water from the river into the house. Gandalin, in despair, got himself an ax, he struck his insensible water carrier with redoubled blows; he then severed fragments off the broomstick, but these immediately rose to their feet, put on their magical form and ran to the river. Instead of a single water carrier, he now had four, then eight, then sixteen,... the more he fought, the more he slew machine men, the more machine men rose to their feet doing their work in spite of Gandalin's effort. The whole river would have passed through his home, if the sorcerer had not returned; but but fortunately he finally did and destroyed the charm.

Water, no doubt, is a good thing; water no less than labor, and no less than capital, is necessary for life.

42

But you can have too much, even of the best things.

Soon to be sixty years old, magical words spoken by philosophers have bestowed honor on work. Political causes, yet more powerful than these

magic words, have changed all men into industrial producers; they pile up the output of production onto the markets seemingly just as fast as the broomsticks carried water, regardless of whether the tank is full or not. Each new scientific application to industry, like Gandalin's ax, brings down the machine man that magic words had made to move, but to immediately put two, four, eight, sixteen, in its place – production continues to increase with a rapidity that is without measure. Hasn't the time come, the moment at least cannot come too soon, when it will be necessary to say: enough already?!!

According to the reigning theory professed in all the schools of political economy today, this time has not yet come; and, even more decisively put, it must never come either. From the persuasion that runs the governments of Europe, without them realizing it of course, it doesn't matter if this time has come for mankind; provided their nation continues to produce and to sell without buying. This contradiction between the practical views of some and the theory of others is one of the great causes of the confusion, dominating in the discussion of all finance laws. Let us stick to examining the system of the philosophers for now. The disciples of Adam Smith, whom, by extending his conjectures, transported them into the region of pure abstractions, Ricardo, and J.-B. Say, to the sorrow of England and France, Mac Culloch, Senior, and all the others that we are accustomed to be consulting like oracles in the olden days, agree that it suffices for the economy to want to take care of the production of wealth; because to them, the greatest prosperity of nations is determined by producing more and more. They hold that production, by bringing a means of exchange into existence, creates the cause of consumption. They say we should never fear that riches will clutter the market, because however much human industry has been producing,

43

since the needs and desires of man are insatiable, he will always convert all this wealth into the enjoyment of things.

However, another economist, gifted with a great power of meditation, a certain Mr. Malthus, who might have done an uptake of science faster if he hadn't too often dragged his opponents into the depths of metaphysics, as well as leaning on moral forces in his calculations made about the exact sciences, had already glimpsed the necessity of maintaining an almost exact balance between production and consumption. He understood very well that the latter was not a necessary consequence of the former. He also realized that the market could be encumbered, so as to make the activity of production a cause of ruin for the producers themselves. But as he was nevertheless convinced, with all those of the school from which he had obtained his knowledge, that the great efficient cause of wealth was to produce ever more and ever faster, to which the nations owed all their power to activate industrialism; it had happened to the somewhat strange conclusion, that it was no less important to activate consumption. The duty of the wealthy class was to quickly eliminate the production that had been accumulating, by hurrying to enjoy, and that their dissipations, just like

government lavishness, were so many acts of beneficence towards those who had to work for a living.

For almost twenty years now, we have spoken out against the system of indefinitely increasing wealth. We never denied that work is something as honorable as it is useful; that mankind didn't rid itself from a prejudice as absurd as it was unjust, when the sources of its happiness and life stopped shrinking. Nor have we ever denied that the accumulation of capital was a necessary activation measure for the industry of man; that the application of science to the industrial arts would not facilitate and multiply this labor, even more than capital would; that man, in taming nature and forcing air, water, steam, into his obedience, would not have made a conquest as glorious as it was useful.

44

But we did say that we could have too much, even of the best things, and that all efforts should be commensurate with their goal; that the goal of work was enjoyment, that the goal of production was consumption. We also admitted that the needs and desires of man are indeed without limits, just as the chrematistic school maintains; but only as far as that goes. For these needs and desires are satisfied by consumption only in as much as these are combined with the means to purchase them. We added that it was not enough to create these means of exchange, to put them in the hands of those who had those wants and needs. And that it even happened often that the things to be exchanged increased in quantity and in value in society, while the demand for labor or the offer of a wage diminished; that then the desires and needs of that part of the population that lived on wages could not be satisfied, and that their consumption thus decreased accordingly. Instead of looking at the growing production of wealth as an unequivocal sign of the prosperity of society, we declared that for nations, just as for individuals, production could be more or less profitable; that it could even realize only losses, and that it was its proportion to the demand for output that determined to what degree production was advantageous. That any manufacturer knows very well, that by always doing the same amount of work, he could gain a lot, he could gain little, or he could even lose. That it was the same with society as a whole; what each one earned each year, or by the work of the land, or by the work of capital, or by the work of its men, formed its revenue; that the revenue of each was the measure of what he could consume; that the combined revenue of all, which formed the social revenue, was the measure of what everyone could consume, or what society actually consumed; because overall consumption would cease very quickly, if the consumer intended to pay for it other than with his revenue, if he dried up the source of it which must suffice in the future as well as at present.

45

Two fundamental questions therefore seem to arise from this confrontation between theories: what is the relationship to maintain between production

and consumption, and what is the true nature of social revenue? We are proposing to address these two questions both in this essay and in the next. When we fix our gaze on human society to understand its organization and the goal towards which it is heading, we feel at first dazzled by the motion of commerce; such conflicts of interest, such intersecting perspectives and volitions swirl before us, that we are not able to grasp what it all means. The only way to think about the direction that man in society must follow, is to isolate them; by supposing that they act for themselves without any exchanges, or trades of any kind, and find out then what his desires and interests would be. This single-man goal must also be the common goal of all men; it must remain the same if the trade is legitimate, that is, if it is intended to serve society and not to turn against one the strength of the other, to enrich some at the expense of others. The real trade is only a sharing of social functions between those who want to achieve a common goal. Everyone exchanges their own services against the services of one's neighbor, each doing only his part; each, in the place of another, continues the action started; but this action is one, as the interest of society is one, as this interest is identical with that of an isolated man, who would thus be working alone and without any exchange of services to meet all his needs. This man alone would be both producer and consumer. His goal, in the work he is doing, would be to satisfy his desires and fulfill his needs; for we only work to enjoy, we only produce to consume. But this man alone, supposedly having the strength or the skill, will he produce more than he can consume, will he thus accumulate wealth? For by this name we will call the products of his labor, which are suitable for satisfying his desires and needs. Yes he will, but only to a certain extent. First he will provide himself

with things that immediately dissipate in enjoyment, such as his food; then those that he will enjoy for a long time by consuming them slowly, such as his clothes; then those whose usefulness will perhaps last longer than he himself, like his housing. These three object classes are all included in his consumption fund. As soon as he has obtained these products, through his work, he enjoys the acquisition; and then begins, by his consumption, to destroy them. But beside its consumption fund, this same man, if he can, will yet keep a fund in reserve. He could not want to owe his bread to daily work, but, by storing grain, will seek to ensure this in advance, throughout the year as his store lessens. He will do the same for all his other provisions of food; besides the clothes he wears daily, he will make others that he only intends to use later, he will even prepare fabrics that he does not count to be making use of for some time. Indeed, he also does not want to be deprived of subsistence if some unforeseen cause forces him to interrupt his work; or if seasonal bad weather won't leave him any fruit; or, wanting to be master over any possible inconstancy occurring at some time; or a preference to indulge and, for a time, surrender to idleness. But after thus having supplied both his consumption fund as well as his fund of reserves, his needs will stop; and although he was very much able to

still indefinitely increase his consumable wealth through his work, he prefers to rest rather than to produce something which he has no way to enjoy. He knows that all his provisions will require care as well, which in effect does amount to the labor of producing it. He knows that just about everything deteriorates in keeping, and that he would have more trouble as well as incur fatigue by accumulating something now, only to wait for the moment to prepare and make use of it.

Thus, by examining the interests of this industrious individual, whom we suppose to be absolutely isolated, we find that his production and his consumption are balanced; but within a certain latitude however, which makes it difficult to subject them to calculation. Indeed, not only did he provide for his sustenance now, but he also prepared things that he has already started to enjoy, and which for a long time will continue to give him pleasures;

47

as well as others that he does not enjoy yet, but that he will keep in reserve for a future need.

However, having thus provided for his consumption fund and his reserve fund, any work he carried out beyond that would be useless, and any product he accumulated would be of no value.

Society taken as a whole is, in absolutely terms, exactly like this man. It has its consumption fund, that is made up of everything that its members already have acquired and is intended for their enjoyment, although, among these things, some are destroyed when each makes use of them, others continue to serve for a time which can indeed be very long. It also has its reserve fund which must provide for accidental interruptions or delays in production, such as in time lost, while sending consumable things from producer to consumer. But after these two funds are full, anything beyond that is unnecessary and ceases to have value. However commerce, or the exchange of goods and services as shared between all members of society, functions as tending to a common goal. Each member, in pursuing his own private goal, loses sight of this general interest, and cannot accurately measure its action insofar it meets everyone's needs. The needed works are shared, and each thinks only of producing one thing. He pursues this goal without knowing exactly how much of this something society asks of him, and he himself would like to produce that indefinitely. Because what he sees in front of him is the possibility, not of piling up any sustenance, but money; or claims on other men's output. He thinks only of enriching himself and does not set limits on his desires. It doesn't however enriches in fact, before the time it finds a consumer, or the intermediary between him and the consumer. It is always the buyer alone who gives real value to his product, and who lets him know whether indeed he did create wealth, or whether he only has given matter a new form, that resulted in society's rejection as being useless.

All consumers, i.e. all individuals

in society, can have both their consumption fund and their reserve fund; they can, besides the things they have already immediately devoted to their use, yet have supplies to await a future need. As a rule however, most rely on commercially stored supplies, because in the universal sharing of social functions, merchants became the administrators of society's reserve fund; they receive in their stores the products which await the convenience of the consumer.

But the institution of commerce, has also made much more significant – the loss that society would incur, by having accumulated a reserve fund of consumable products that is disproportionate to its needs. Commerce has recognized that misjudgments compensate each other, that the average of dedicated works and its products every year is roughly the same.

When each one prepared for, on his own account, accommodating the uncertainties of the future, he must have wanted to secure provisions for himself, covering for even for the most unfortunate set of circumstances, and therefore the most improbable, bad luck. But when commerce instead is responsible for covering all the chances of all individuals in society, and since it knows that most of these hazards will offset each other, it can do so with a fund much lower than the sum of the funds that everyone would have calculated for himself. Thus an isolated family would probably wish to have their supply of wheat, in advance storage for two or three years; so much as the calamity of being deprived of their wheat by two bad harvests in a row seems formidable to them.

Commerce, on the other hand, tries to calculate fairly accurately from its experiences in the past, the consumption of all; so that its supply of wheat exceeds at most a month or two in any current year. Because it loses on all the wheat it stores in too great a quantity; first, in interest on the advanced capital and second, on its purchase price – because, after the harvest, the old wheat is no longer competitive in price with the new wheat. The fabric trade is perhaps even more vigilant in limiting its social reserve fund. It seeks to ever present the consumer with an assortment that can seduce his taste or his whims, but at the same time it constantly has to consider that everything it does not sell quickly causes a considerable loss; advanced capital bears interest against it, fabrics become tarnished, fashion does

change, and unsalable store reserves are the ruin of merchants. And that's not the end of it either – the more activity commerce entails, the more, as common wisdom notes, society gets richer; and the more its reserve fund decreases. By the singular consequence of its activity, society needs ever less accumulated merchandise, while it's producing it faster. The same also goes for the establishment of a bank. Bankers find the requirement to keep cash on hand, for each of the merchants with whom they conduct their business, reduced when their clientele increases.

An established shop where each household gets into the habit of going to stock up every day, this shop contains much less provisions than when it

was used to keeping some provisions in reserve for all the households that might come calling any time. Since we started to concentrate the retail trade in large warehouses, and to supply from there all the shopkeepers, sometimes even all the regional consumers, all the merchandise markets which were crowded with merchants in both the wholesale and retail trade were abolished; since the goods produced now circulate with the speed of lightning by trains and steamboats, we removed all those that dragged themselves along with the speed of crawling rollers. Merchandise spends less time in the manufacturer's facility, incurs less travel time, and less time in the retailer's store; it is barely finished when it passes into the hands of the one who makes use of. But speed in goods' delivery can be accounted for as part of the profit, or rather, it is calculated in; and because of it, the merchant can sell at a lower price. Whenever there is a snag however, whenever there's a downtime somewhere in the circulation, the holder of the goods experiences a loss; first that of the interest of his money, then the bottleneck of its capital, next the suspension of its trade, which can lead to its ruin. So commerce, taken as a whole, is much more sensitive to mishaps in calculation, than the isolated man was in not letting his reserve fund grow; but to the contrary by incessantly reducing it, yet trying to maintain an equal balance between production and consumption.

50

Before congregating in society, men could not possibly misunderstand the goal they had in mind for carrying out any of their works; everyone knew what was needed, everyone compared the fatigue associated with work with the reward afterwards found in enjoying the result, everyone could estimate in advance whether what he wanted was worth the trouble it would take to get it, if what he had was worth the trouble to keep it, if what he feared was worth the trouble to avoid it; and, according to this triple comparison, he regulated his work in terms of its daily consumption, as to the size of his consumption fund, and its needed reserves. But since men, through a congregation in society and the introduction of commerce, have removed common thought from the pursuit of their common interest, partial interests alone could make themselves dominant; and it is to these that we entrusted the maintenance and truth of political economy; and the direction that work of all should take, so as to provide the needs of all. The economic conditions were separated by the introduction and progress of commerce. To some, the earth has remained their source of existence, to others it became capital, and to others yet only the strength of their limbs. To all the desire to be a winner and always win more, to make ever greater use of the power that remained in them to produce. So the landowner does everything in his power for his land to be put entirely in valuable use, so that it is cultivated with the most abundant resulting harvest, so that finally this causes him the fewest expenses possible, so that by selling it cheaply, he obtains a preference over its competitors. The capitalist, certainly with no less eagerness, studies conditions to find an advantageous engagement for his capital, to engender industrial production, that because of its utility, its novelty, or its cheapness, he can sell, when other manufacturers could

not; because their capital is useless to them, as they couldn't make it work. Finally the common man, destined to drudgery and sorrow, can only live insofar that he works. He therefore seeks to be not a day without work, he offers himself to whomever wants to use him; and he recommends himself

51

by showing, that by his strength or his skill he can perform superior work than another man in a shorter time, or that he can work longer, or more cheaply. These three classes are therefore equally pondering as to how to produce to an advantage over the other two, either to produce cheaper, or to produce more but at a lower price; so as to make up in quantity what is lost in price. They are reasoning to do so however, without considering at all the power in consumer decision making to buy; rather, they regard this ability as invariable and only fight among themselves over who will be able to make himself preferred; each seeking its advantage in a faster flow, and thus cheaper output which will ruin its rivals.

But as the productive classes use all their powers to increase their own outputs, commerce, in its proper understanding as distributing wealth to those who are going to make use of it, just as energetically rejects this overconfidence in productive power. Each merchant refuses to take on goods, whose selling facility does not seem to him to be quick and easy. His reasoning is to keep as little of it as he can in storage, to renew his assortments as frequently as he can; as he will experience a loss as soon as his capital ceases to circulate with the greatest possible rapidity. From his point of view about his affairs, it seems singularly imprudent to urge on producers, who are already quite active enough on their own accord, and force them to throw themselves into the business of yet greater quantities, that actually repels him. It would seem a lot more natural to him to address consumers instead; for it is from the increase in consumption that any truly profitable increase in production must depend. But on the other hand, the increase in consumption is something quite different from an increase in expenditures, so that we hardly understand how the means recommended to nations to get richer relates to them spending more.

There is no shortage of real-life examples that point to the contrary: of lavish governments, of nations that spent well beyond their means, and did not include, among other things, expenses to go to war; and such prodigality has constantly been causing their exhaustion and ruin.

52

Several governments, it is true, by remaining attached to the mercantile system, made it their nations' objective to produce much, and to consume little; and sell to foreigners all the surplus of their production over their consumption; counting that they would receive in return – gold or silver, which would accumulate indefinitely in their coffers.

All economists nowadays, true enough, are in total agreement that this system is demonstrably false. They proved that precious metals, like any other commodity, escaped from a market where they were superabundant;

that there was no more advantage, than only the remotest possibility of accumulating them; that there was even a profit to be had to do without them altogether, when they could be replaced by bank issued notes; that in the final analysis, nations were always buying from foreigners as much as they sold to them. We won't repeat their arguments again here, because they have remained unanswered; and by now they have been accepted as establishing a demonstrated truth. Non of this has prevented the English ministry however, that even amongst all of those who have most fully adopted the principles of the new school, to yet persist in wanting to make England the manufacturer of the universe. It wants the peoples of Europe, those of America, those of India, all to become the clients of the English merchants; and that each new progression of domestic industries, is solidly linked to the opening of new markets abroad. At the same time, instead of accounting for consumption on exchanges that are balancing in a growing economy, this same minister continues to flatter himself as having been successfully excluding foreign markets from other foreign producers, and that it will be the English who will get there instead, either with better quality products or ones that are inferior in price.

We will content ourselves with saying the following about this system, to which the men in power and perhaps even the common people still hold onto with so much obstinacy in their practice, although all have abandoned in theory, that nations are in rivalry with each other. A gained prosperity of an industry in some, causes the ruin of this same industry in others; and if all adopt at the same time the intention

to each year export a greater mass of goods onto the foreign markets, with all offering their merchandise at a discount and thereby make every effort to remove customers from their competitors, and intending to sell more than they buy – this intention will encumber the world market as a whole, and will be harmful to all; or else, only one will be able to succeed at the very expense of all the others. And then this party alone will profit from the “freedom of trade”, while all the others will have to defend themselves against an industry that is killing theirs. So this same English minister who encouraged increasing the home production has adopted a system that is in fact prohibitive.

The heads of the chrematistic school, on the contrary: Messrs Ricardo, J.-B. Say, MacCulloch and their disciples are in favor of absolute freedom in the exchanges between nations; they established that their system, instead of being exclusively oriented, could be followed by all at the same time; that producers, instead of being in rivalry, were mutually acting as clients to each other. They admit that a necessary balance between production and consumption exists out of necessity; but the last, they say, is always bound to increase with the first. As to foreign trade, no disturbance in the already existing balance between these two quantities occurs either; it only fulfills, through the introduction into the market of equal values, the now yet more varied tastes of consumers. If, for example, the production of cotton sheets increases in England by a hundred thousand pieces per year, all foreign

trade does is allow the English, instead of consuming in kind the hundred thousand additional sheets, to now consume that same value in groceries, wines, or any other form that the trade will be able to present to them with. In the eyes of Messrs. Say and Ricardo, by creating items to be exchanged, we create exchanges and therefore consumption. Equality of consumption to production seems to them always demonstrated, either we consider the market of the whole known universe, or we suppose each nation isolated from all the others.

Mr. Ricardo and after him Mr. MacCulloch believed to have demonstrated the truth of this system by a form of reasoning which was specific to them: "Let us suppose," they said, "a hundred ploughmen

54

producing a thousand bags of wheat, and a hundred manufacturers in wool producing a thousand yards of cloth; let's disregard all other products useful to man, all the intermediaries between them; let us consider only these two in the world. They will exchange their thousand ells for their thousand bags. Let us now suppose the ongoing progress of industry; say labor productivity increases by a tenth; now, these same men exchange eleven hundred ells, against eleven hundred bags; and each of them is better dressed and better fed. Further progress makes twelve hundred ells trade against twelve hundred bags, and so on; the increase in product never increases the enjoyment of those that produce."

This form of reasoning, as we said before, is typical within the English chrematistic school, but we must add that we do not know of any which carries less conviction with it. These philosophers, in fact, claim to simplify a question by neglecting all its accessories; but in this way they give to their supposition an absurd, contradictory character to which the mind refuses to lend itself. Yes, however, we try to develop it, we cannot see where the reasoning is wrong, because in vain we arrive at absurd consequences, they are no more so than the supposition from which we started. Here we are represented with a farmer exchanging all the wheat he harvests for cloth. That we remember, is the final exchange intended for consumption, not a temporary market soon followed by another exchange for items the farmer needs. Good, but what kind of farmer is in business to exchange all his wheat for cloth?

A regular farmer, after having kept part of his wheat which he needs for himself, exchanges the surplus to get the things he also needs. But his need for clothes is by no means increased because he harvested more wheat; just as the clothier, for having made more fabrics, has none the better appetite. The consumption of wheat can only increase if there are at the same time both more mouths for it to eat and more revenue to pay for it; but if the

55

consumers become richer without becoming more numerous, their consumption of wheat, instead of increasing, may well decrease. Because,

as they cannot eat more than they did before, they will likely eat more delicate things, meat, for example, instead of bread; and they will ask that the fields be converted into meadows, and that plowmen are dismissed. The consumption of fabrics can probably increase somewhat without a population increase; the farmer, perhaps more at his ease, may ask for two pairs of clothes made from the same sheet, instead of one. But if he keeps on seeing his revenue grow, he will give up his ordinary clothes and ask for finer ones; he will discourage therefore the existing manufacture, and call for a new one. Mr. Ricardo's reasoning is based on two assumptions that we both believe to be false (1).

(1a) I had a discussion with Mr. Ricardo in the last year of his life, the memory of which will always be precious to me. He brought to it all the urbanity, the good faith, and love of the truth that distinguished him. I tried to explain to him what the consequences of the increase in the productive powers of labor would be in agriculture. By limiting myself like him to plowing alone, to the sole production of wheat, and by also acknowledging, like him, the English system of renting, where farmers make day laborers work — whom they can dismiss at any time for whatever reason. Allow me to insert a long footnote here to reproduce this presentation. Quite hypothetical calculations seem to me to have too uncertain a basis to merit a place in the text. Suppose a farmer who, on a given area of land, maintains ten members of his family, servants and laborers working for him, and who makes his domain produce one hundred and twenty bags of wheat annually. In order not to complicate our accounts too much, we will disregard any other product of its agriculture, or we represent it by wheat. Let us suppose further that the wages which he gives to each of these workers are equivalent to ten sacks of his wheat; of these ten bags, the worker will consume three in kind per year; he will employ the other seven of them in procuring by trade the other products of agriculture or manufactures which, after bread, are necessary for life. The head farmer will have twenty bags left. To further simplify our accounts, we assume him to be the owner at the same time as the farmer. However, ten bags are necessary for him, three in kind, and seven in necessities of life, to live, equal to each of his workers; ten other bags will provide him, through exchanges, with the pleasures that we will call luxuries, those he does not share with all the rest of working men.

56

The first is that any increase in production is equal to an increase in revenue, while we believe that it often realizes only a loss; the second, that any increase

(1b) Let us recap: the field produces one hundred and twenty bags of wheat, of which thirty-three are eaten on the spot, by those who work it, seventy-seven are exchanged for the necessities of life; they are therefore eaten by those who produce the goods that the poor buy; ten are exchanged for luxury items; they are therefore eaten by those who produce the commodities that the rich buy; for we call rich they who, after having provided for their needs, can earmark part of their revenue for enjoyment. At some time, a discovery in mechanics, a new machine invented for plowing the earth, or the art of taming domestic animals, and making them perform human-like labor, increased by fifty percent the products of the labor of rural man. If we had taken as an example a family of landowners, all of whose members had roughly equal rights, the discovery would benefit all equally; eight hours of work would be enough, for the eleven members of this family, to obtain the yields which they obtained previously with twelve; and if there was no subsequent demand for work which would benefit them all equally, they would rest four more hours a day.

But we have assumed society in its current organization; on the one hand, an owner who manages the work by himself, who alone collects the fruits, and who alone benefits from any technological discoveries; on the other hand, laborers who have no other property than their aptitude for work, and no revenue other than their wages. Each of our farmer's workers had produced twelve sacks of wheat for him; each, according to the discovery, will be able to produce eighteen. However, the quantity of wheat that the farmer wants to produce is limited: 1° by the size of his fields; 2° by the value of its agricultural capital; and 3° by the demand of the market to which he intends the surplus of his harvests to go. He does his account: seven workers, at eighteen bags per man, will now produce him one hundred and twenty-six bags; that's six more than before; to sell them, he will, if it's at all necessary, make a slight reduction in price. He'll therefore dismiss three of his workers, and continue to run his farm with the same extent of fields, the same capital, but now with only seven workers, instead of the ten, whom he initially employed at the same wages. Let's do our account again. The estate produces one hundred and twenty-six bags; we have seven workers and a master to whom we provide the necessities of life at the rate of ten bags per man, totaling eighty bags. We also have forty-six bags which remain with the master for his luxury pleasures. As for the first batch, twenty-four bags will be eaten in kind on the estate, instead of thirty-three which used to consume; fifty-six bags, instead of seventy-seven, will be exchanged for the necessities of life, and eaten by those who produce the goods that are bought by the poor; as for the second batch,

57

of revenue determines an increase in consumption. While we believe that more often it only determines the consumption of things that are in no way superior,

(1c) forty-six bags, instead of ten, must be exchanged for what we have called luxury items: they will therefore be eaten by those who work in luxury-goods production, but only when these new manufactures, only recently having become viable, do indeed exist. We have therefore, with a very slight increase in the product, a very notable decrease in the consumption of the two existing industries, agriculture and manufacture of the poor; on the other hand, we will have almost quintupled the demand for, which was previously a barely nascent industry, the manufacture for the rich.

Making more noticeable this change in consumption types, which results from progress in an industry not determined by a greater demand for labor, let us consider this same kind of progress but from a different point of view. We have assumed that ten sacks of wheat represented the proper wages of a man; that he ate three, that he exchanged seven, and thus a considerable part of his wages reappeared as wages of the workers who worked for his demand. The farm, in its original state, producing 120 bags of wheat, therefore paid their wages to ten plowmen, to their master, to a luxury worker; plus eighty-four bags that these twelve people exchanged with those who provided them with all the other objects necessary for life, except wheat. This supposes another eight workers two fifths working for them. We can imagine that these in turn trade in the seven bags of wheat which they do not eat in kind; that those who work for them do too, until all of the wheat has been distributed among forty people, at the rate of three bags per person. Of these forty people, there is only one who consumes luxury items; there is only one also which produces them. The industry then takes the first step we have assumed to be; by a discovery in agriculture, the product of the labor of the plowmen is increased by fifty per cent. The farmer fired three of his laborers, and increased his production to one hundred and twenty-six bags. His farm therefore pays a wage of eighty bags, to himself and to seven laborers. Among them eight, they make a demand for the poor man's labor equal to fifty-six bags, or to five workers and two-fifths: these workers call for others, up until the totality of the eighty bags, which represent the labor necessary to bring forth the whole harvest, gave bread to twenty-six workers two-thirds, occupied in creating the necessities of life. By comparing this state to that which precedes, there will therefore be thirteen workers and a third in suffering, or who will not have yet received their bread. It is true

that we hope that they will receive it from the luxury manufacture. Indeed, the owner offers forty-six bags to be exchanged for the products of the luxury manufacture, or of that which must provide for his personal enjoyments; and as this work does not yet exist, he must encourage it by

58

in quantity, but of a higher price. So when the plowman, by some progress in agricultural science, succeeds in increasing the fruit of his labor, he will not ask

(1d) a higher wage; he offers twelve, fourteen, fifteen bags of wheat, instead of ten, to the one who gives him the pleasures that his new wealth makes him desire; all that the luxury worker receives in addition to his necessary wages, he uses up in luxury pleasures in his turn. The rest goes to the manufacture of the poor; but it is only after the luxury factory will have been created, it is only after the forty-six bags due to be shared with the master will have passed through the hands of these luxury workers, and that the surplus will have been exchanged by them; it is only then, I say, that bread will be returned to all those who offer to work. When this distribution is accomplished, out of forty-two people who will henceforth share in this harvest, thirty-seven and three-fifths, instead of thirty-nine, will work to produce the objects necessary for life, four and two-fifths to produce the luxury items, and the population will have increased by two people (*).

We thus manage, like Mr. Ricardo, to find that at the end of circulation, if it is nowhere stopped prematurely, production will have created consumption; but it is by disregarding time and space, as the German meta-physicians would do; it is by disregarding all the obstacles which can stop this circulation; and the closer we look at it, the more we see that these obstacles have become multiplied.

By the supposed change, three workers are dismissed from agriculture, and the livelihood of ten, in the factories, which was previously assured, is more or less compromised; it now depends on a future contingent, the establishment of a new luxury manufacture.

It is therefore on the prompt training of these luxury workers that the restoration of balance depends. But first of all they don't exist; we must give birth to them, somehow. The owner, who earned only ten sacks on his farm, was far from thinking of asking for the kind of work he imagines he needs ever since he earned forty-six. The coach builders, the ice-cream makers, the watchmakers, whose output he desires, have not yet been born; if he is reduced to waiting for them, from the moment of their conception till the moment when they will be able to earn a living. The process will appear dreadfully long to men who are doing without in the mean time, while waiting for them to know how to do their work. The patience of the former will still be

(*) We assumed that ten bags represented all the objects necessary for the workers, working with the going degree of ease in their class at that time. The forty-six sacks will then only feed four luxury workers and two-fifths, however they are distributed. If their wages rise to fifteen bags, the master himself will employ only three luxury workers; but these three will employ between themselves a fourth; and this fourth, part of the time of a fifth.

59

a greater quantity of manufactured articles than consumed before, he will perhaps ask for less, but he will devote the surplus of his revenue to his luxury, and

(1e) put to a cruel test; however short we suppose the apprenticeship of grown men, who will consent to learn a new trade, to be.

However, here is another embarrassment; to found a new manufacture, to wit – a luxury manufacture, one also needs new capital. First it is necessary to build machines, to bring in raw materials, to give activity to a distant trade; for the rich are seldom satisfied with the pleasures that arise under their feet. Where, however, will we find this new capital, perhaps much more than all that agriculture requires? The whole social apparatus was given impetus by the invention of the plow, or by the art of harnessing animals to it. This invention did not give rise to any new capital. Our luxury workers are still a long way from eating the wheat of our laborers, from wearing the clothes of our common factories; they are not trained; they may not yet have been born, their professions do not exist, the subjects they have to work on have not arrived from abroad. All those to whom they were to distribute their bread are waiting in vain.

But let's try another guess. Our farmer owner, when he made the discovery that increases the productive powers of labor, instead of firing three of his workers, keeps all ten on. Indeed, these workers who can only live on their work will not be resigned to fold their arms and die of hunger. They know of no other trade than plowing, and as long as they have a breath of life, they will continue to offer the labor of their hands at a discount, to make wheat, with the increased powers given to them by the new discoveries. This competition will lower the wages of all rural workers; let us suppose that it only drops by a tenth, and this is certainly not too much, if we take into account on the one hand the number of day laborers left without work, on the other the difficulty experienced by the master owner increasing its operation by a third (*).

(*) It may be said that after having established that ten sacks represent the necessary wages, it is absurd to suppose that the workers are satisfied with less than the necessary. But we do not know how much is required to maintain the life of the worker, and it is not from him that we have heard it. In each more or less prosperous state of society, there is a common wage, sufficient to supply not only the needs, but also the barest enjoyments compatible with manual labor. It is the wages that, in short, were named necessary; we cannot say how far it can be reduced, nor how far the life of the worker can be stripped of all kinds of enjoyment.

60

for short, we call luxury anything that exceeds one's primary needs. He will therefore disparage manufactures that already exist, those of essential items to him, while he

(1f) In this new hypothesis, the farm will produce one hundred and eighty bags, but the ten workers will only receive ninety, to which we will add ten which represent the master owner's share in the items necessary for the life. Of these hundred bags, thirty-three are consumed in kind on the farm, sixty-seven are exchanged with manufactured items for the poor. Before the discovery, it consumed seventy-seven. The wages are therefore reduced in an even greater proportion than they are in agriculture; however, everyone lives, everyone works, and everyone can expect the effect that will be produced by the eighty bags shared with the owner, and intended to encourage the manufacturing of new luxury goods.

If, in fact, we succeed in creating eight new luxury-goods workers, and that these, having the eighty bags which fall to them in share, in their turn encourage the manufacture of the poor; when the dealings are over, the population will be increased by a third, and sixty people instead of forty will have to eat the wheat from the supposed farm; but it is also in this second hypothesis that we disregard time and space.

Space must be ignored – the new invention made seven men sufficient to cultivate the land that occupied ten previously. In order not to dismiss these three men, in order not to condemn them to starve to death, we must assume that there is a new cultivable area, new land to be cleared; which cannot be absolutely true of all countries and all times.

Moreover, it is not enough that the land to be cultivated exists, it must also be in such hands, that as soon as one offers its owners a profit, they are determined to put it under

cultivation. Let us examine, however, how the waste lands of Europe are linked, so as to shield them from the requests of those who offer to develop them through their work. Here they are inalienable commons; there, lands supported by people who have neither capital nor the means to give guarantees to those who would lend them; elsewhere, vanity is interested in keeping everything in the old state. The rights of the crown, of the church, of the nobility, of the people, are opposed in turn to this action of the market, on which the economists are counting, and whose power seemed to them to be irresistible. It is in fact easier for the English to go and clear the deserts of Canada, or those of the Kalahari, than the commons in the vicinity of London. Time must be disregarded – when we suppose that the farmer, who, by a discovery made in a mechanical or rural industry, finds the means to increase the productive powers of his workers by a third, will also find sufficient capital to increase its operations by a third; to increase by a third its agricultural implements, its workforce, its cattle, its granaries, and

will call for the existence of factories which do not exist again, thus luxury manufactures. Likewise, when the fabric manufacturer, by some progress in his industry, by

(1g) its circulating capital which must be used to await and draw its revenue. Time must be disregarded – when we assume luxury-goods workers, and the ready capital to found luxury factories, and be sufficient to consume the eighty bags intended for them this year, instead of the ten that they were receiving the previous year. We must also ignore time – when supposedly sixty people are now ready to eat the wheat of this new crop, while there were only forty to eat the wheat of the previous crop. Thus when a discovery in the productive powers of labor is applied to agriculture, without having been provoked by a previous demand for labor; when, moreover, society is organized in such a way that only one being the owner and all the others bidding to let their work at a labor auction, only one benefits from the discovery put forward to them by the progress of technology; men, capital, materials, industry, are all lacking to balance all the rest of society with the too rapid pace of agriculture.

Our reasoning would be just as applicable to any other types of industry, as to that which produces wheat; but, if we have reason to fear that, even for this one, our calculations have appeared both too tiring and too hypothetical at the same time and, we should have expected to put off our readers still more, if we had set our example in a factory, because the manufacturer's consumption of his own products is considerably much less than those made by the farmer.

However, imagine that a discovery which spares a third of the labor force from working is successively introduced into all the factories which produce all the parts of the poor man's clothes, utensils, furnishings; everywhere it will only be the manufacturer himself who will benefit. If this state of affairs dismisses three out of ten workers, it will produce a fraction more with a little less people; everywhere, it will decrease by three tenths the consumption which its own workers partook in of its own articles, and it will decrease in the same proportion the consumption of those who worked for its workers. So that each novel discovery, in such circumstances, decreases the demand for the already existing workshops, creating one, in compensation; which however is addressed to workshops that do not yet exist. Each discovery makes the maintenance of the part of manufacturing dedicated to the poor dependent on the creation of a luxury manufacture, reemploying the poor; and yet one cannot create a luxury factory without capital, hence without workers, and without a waste of time, which those whose livelihood is suspended cannot support. The hat maker, with his ten workers, make at least twelve hundred hats a year. He himself, and with his workers, will consume just eleven of those, and the circulation of that output is only accomplished

the application of some technological discovery, succeeds in producing more to earn more, it is in no way his consumption of wheat that will increase. It may well decrease, as far as alimentation is concerned, if the enlarged revenue becomes dedicated to a more luxurious table and ditto agriculturally-directed dedication. So for example, the plowman and the clothier may well be walking at an even step towards an improvement of their industry; but they will not become, to a greater extent than they were previously, each other's clients. Also, it is important to note that a luxury manufacture doesn't employ more hands, only more skilled hands. Everything to do with luxury agriculture, such as the fattening of herds, employs not more, but fewer hands than plowing. We have, without giving it sufficient attention, arrived at a completely new condition of society, about which we don't have any experience yet. We tend to completely separate any kind of ownership from any type of work, to sever all links in the sale of output between the day laborer and the employer, to remove from the wages of the first any kind of association with the profits of the second. This social organization is so new, that it is not yet even half established. In the most industrious, the richest, and the most advanced societies in the system; we are barely even trying to understand it. Where the labor in agriculture, as well as in manufacturing, is done by workers who can be dismissed at the end of every week. This is where we trending toward, and this is where we need point out the danger lies, and not in the discoveries of new technologies. The focus of our attention has been very much on this new organization of society, on this universal competition, which degenerates into hostility between the rich and working classes,

(1h) once he has covered twelve hundred heads. However, if we assume them to be in the same circumstances as the farmer, we will first see him dedicating twelve hundred hats and covering twelve hundred heads, to provide the necessary wages for himself and his ten workers; while after the hypothetical discovery in hat making which will increase their productive power by a third, and dismissing three workers, his factory will only consume eight of its own hats. The direct exchange of his hats with all the manufacturing output intended for the poor and agriculture will draw off seven hundred and ninety-two; while he will offer four hundred and sixty to the luxury manufacture, that it will take sixty new heads to wear his hats, and that there will be however three hundred poor who will have to do without hats, until the luxury factory, encouraged by the enriched hatter to become in existence, is in full activity.

that we no longer can conceive of any other possible mode of existence, even though the debris of the current set up is surrounding us on all sides. We believe to be answered with the absurd argument of whitewashing the defects of previous systems. In reality, two or three systems have followed one another, in terms of the organization of the lower classes in society; but, they do not deserve regret. Because, after doing a little good at first, they then did inflict terrible calamities on the human species. Can we not conclude today, that we have arrived at the truth? that we have discovered a fundamental flaw in the day-laborers' system as we have discovered in

the past that of slavery, vassalage, and the trade guilds? When these three systems were ongoing, we could in no way conceive of what could come next. Correcting the existing order would have seemed, likewise, either absurd or impossible. The time will undoubtedly come too, when our grandchildren will not judge us less barbaric for having left the working classes without guarantee, that they will judge us in the same way as we ourselves judge as barbarians, the nations that did enslave these same classes.

Each of these systems appeared, in turn and at the time, to be a happy invention, to be a progress towards civilization. Slavery itself, odious as it may be remembered now, succeeded a savage state of almost universal war, where man, ceaselessly under arms, had no time left to devote to his work, no guarantee to harvest the fruits that his earlier work had initiated; slavery, succeeding the massacre of the vanquished, was a progress in society, it allowed the accumulation of wealth, it became, first among the Greeks and then the Romans, the basis of a civilization almost equal to ours.

As long as the masters remained poor, as long as they worked and ate with their slaves, the condition of the latter was bearable and the population grew. The system's evolution, the wealth of the masters, their luxury, their ignorance of all work, their contempt for this part of the population and the making them live on the sweat of their brows, their cruelty, their avarice which constantly took something away from the subsistence of this human cattle, finally sowed mortality

64

in the working class. They made it disappear, in the time of the greatest splendor of the Roman Empire; when economists, if there were any then, perhaps applauded it as exemplified in the constant progress of opulence. The malignancy of antiquity was slavery. It was the state of oppression and misery to which the slaves had been reduced which annihilated the population of the Roman Empire, and that as such was delivered to the barbarians. The latter, at least after a few centuries, invented a more generous system; they substituted protection and patronage between the lord and his underlings, to the whip which had long disciplined order in slavery.

Feudalism had its brilliant and prosperous times, when the armed vassal fought alongside his lord. When the lord, having become rich, thought only of acquiring more and more wealth and to display ever more luxury, he weighted down once again his yoke on the poor, and the feudal system became intolerable.

The peoples then conquered the system of freedom where we are at now; but, when they broke the yoke that they had carried for such a long time, these men of sorrow were not stripped of any property. In the countryside, as sharecroppers, as taxpayers, as farmers, they soon found themselves associated with land ownership. In the cities, as members of trade guilds, which they had formed for their mutual defense, they found themselves associated with the ownership of their industry. This are our times, it is at

this very moment that the progress of wealth and competition are breaking these associations. The revolution is not even half accomplished. But the farmer, who has become rich, has stopped working with his hands; he has separated himself from the day laborer, and he deals with him in neglect. The owner of the workshop, who has become rich, instead of working on the same bench with a journeyman and an apprentice, has given up manual work, bringing together thousands of laborers in his place of work, and dealing with them in disrespectful ways. Certainly our experience is very recent in this social order which puts all those who work in conflict with each other, because this social order has only just begun.

65

The burdened species of the products of human industry that we sought to explain could hardly have shown up in previous periods of society. During the state of barbarism, when each man worked only for himself, each man also knew his needs; and it was in no way to be feared that he would be imposing an unnecessary fatigue on himself to create goods he did not want. In the slavery system which succeeded it, and which allowed the development of a fairly large civilization, the master likewise only asked his slave for those products of which he had determined in advance their usefulness. His request had preceded and initiated the work; completed, its consumption followed immediately. Clutter only became possible when the slave master became a manufacturer and merchant, as today is true for a planter in Jamaica. In the feudal system, the lord demanded from his vassals many more services and combat duty than lucrative jobs. Industry, far from being exciting, was strongly discouraged; and it was not because output clutter was threatening. In the system of trade association by guilds, all industrial progress benefited the same people who exercised it. Each of them proportioned his efforts to the market that he had to supply. The farmer still preferred to rest, rather than to produce wheat which he could not sell. And the guild associations have often been criticized for their cities never to have had any other policy than to restrict their products, to remain in control of the market, and to always strive to do less work than was asked for, so as to sell it better. The state we are entering today is completely new; the working population is free; but no guarantee has been given as to its subsistence. It must make a living from its work; but it neither sees, nor knows who will consume the products of this work. It has no means of measuring its efforts in terms of the reward it can expect. When the merit of so many millions of men rests on a theory that no experience has justified yet, it is only fair to view it with some suspicion.

66

Moreover, let it not be believed that antiquity never had reflected on the difficulty that concerns us today, that it had never looked for, never found the solution. If the question of the balance of consumption with production is fundamental to political economy, as we believe it is; if it is a necessary condition of the progress of the arts, industry, and civilization, that every

man who works produces more than the value of what he consumes, and that consequently therefore producers alone cannot suffice for everything to be consumed; it is necessary that, for each increase in the productive powers of labor, there is a corresponding increase in the consumption of a class of people who don't produce anything, or whose products are not marketable. This is the same conclusion that Mr. Malthus came to in his latest work on political economy, where he found a reason to affirm that the very lavishness of government sometimes did serve public wealth; by creating a class of consumers and idlers, without which production would soon have been halted by over-saturated markets.

It seems to us that the ancients had already arrived a lot further in these conclusions than we are at nowadays, considering the general progress of society. We will not attribute the reasoning behind their implemented policies regarding the lavishness of the government of Athens any more than those of the English government with respect to the final principles of Mr. Malthus; but they still had recognized that, in order to maintain this essential equilibrium between production and consumption in society, it was urgent to utilize three means: first, to use the surplus of cash crops to feed workers with whose output wasn't sold, but were employed in public, civil, and religious monumental works; second, to encourage luxuries that were consumed by the rich, so that these in turn call for the labor of the poor; and third, to give the whole mass of its citizens an occupation of the mind, a patriotic occupation of the hours that the progress of industry freed up as a saving on needed work.

The first means, which was more or less used by all the states of antiquity, nowhere seen

better developed than in the various Kingdoms of Egypt. This country was covered by an agricultural population whose number still astonishes the imagination; and, as it combined the advantages of: fertile sun, fertile soil and an abundance of water, was drawing from the earth a quantity of food almost infinitely greater than what it could consume. The Egyptians had a decided aversion, whether political or religious, against exploration and trade. They therefore sought to be self-sufficient and hardly traded with foreigners at all; exporting neither their wheat nor the products of their factories, and the latter never became at all prominent. The form their government took had no room for an extended nobility who consumed, in luxury, what their countrymen had produced by the sweat of their brows. And in fact, among the ruins of a great many temples that cover Egypt, there is no palace to be found. There was, true enough, a large class of all-powerful priests; but their religion imposed on them an asceticism which excluded luxury. And their personal consumption was hardly superior to that of workers. These priests looked for ways and means to keep the mass of Egyptians in the habit of constant labor, and of an abstinence that was commensurate with their industry. They always wanted them ignorant and submissive; they wanted leisure times that did not allow them to develop the faculties of their mind, but instead those of their bodies; and during the

later Kingdoms gave them the gigantic task to house all the deities of Mt. Olympus in their temples, monuments such as the world will never see again. Similar ones covered Upper Egypt, and their proportions are so colossal that one almost refuses to believe that human strength has been sufficient to raise them; and their finish is so delicate that eternity seems to have belonged to those who thus lavished their time to accomplish them through work during successive generations. The catacombs, underground caves in the mountains bordering the Nile valley, do not contain lesser wonders. The immensity of all these works confuses our senses and our reason. It took the constant work of many millions of workers, for several hundred years,

68

to create this enchanted world. But without a doubt, these millions of men needed to eat the wheat from the tilled Egyptian lands. It took a multitude of stone dressers, movers, and masons to consume what the industrious inhabitants of the Nile Valley incessantly produced.

The ancient Hindustan also conceals efforts which almost equal those of Egypt in extent and perfection. There, too, religion commanded useless but colossal work, because social organization had multiplied the effect of production, and it had almost done away with those who consume without producing anything. The Etruscans, and all peoples over whom the priestly estate exercised great power, adopted more or less the same policy. There are monuments in Rome that even predate the earliest historical period, the construction of which being hardly explainable, carried out long before the beginning of Roman opulence; and only by the power which the colleges of priests wielded over the ancient inhabitants of the region. By this very policy, the entire population could work without encumbering the market; morals were kept pure, robust bodies were maintained, and equality was not disturbed. Each participated for an equal share in the enjoyment of its monuments, as an audience formed by the combined work of the nation. On the other hand however, the constant work of all stopped all further developments of the mind, also; and so the nation was left helpless to the ambitious caste of priests, who had undertaken to govern it.

The second system of antiquity was almost ours; at Sybaris, at Corinth, at Syracuse; in Tiro, Carthage, and in Rome, late in its days when this capital of the world was already leaning towards its decline, manufacturing and trade were abandoned to their natural course: the excess of production over consumption by those who produced was immense. It first fed a large export trade; but soon after it formed a class of lascivious rich, whose sole occupation was to constantly alter their enjoyments; these wealthy lived to rest, to consume, and to enjoy themselves, just as

69

the rest of their fellow citizens were living to work. As the work was done almost entirely by slaves, there was no place for the struggle that we are seeing taking place nowadays, to obtain the work of tradesmen ever more

cheaply. And even supposing that in some occupations the market was indeed oversaturated with goods, the suffering that could have resulted for the slaves involved would have hardly raised an eyebrow of their owners, and certainly did not leave traces in history.

But the legislators of antiquity, who had analyzed the consequences of a greater number of free states than us, who had meditated much longer on the idea that a government is only instituted for the happiness of all its peoples subject to it, and not for that of just one wealthy class, condemned the sybantic system out of hand. The idea seemed to them subversive of a republican equality; establishing as valid, that some work so that others enjoy. They found that the excess of opulence always attracted an excess of baseness and servility; that souls were irritated by an excessive ease and bodily softness; and that a whirlwind of pleasures was just as contrary to a proper development of the mind as the constant fatigue of manual labor could be. They came to the conclusion that if they enabled all citizens to enjoy the increased leisure acquired by the progress of industry, this then would ennoble their character; that, if they granted complete idleness to a small number of them, they would condemn them at the same time to an addiction to pleasures. They therefore agreed with all the philosophers and moralists, with all religious men, and in particular with all the Fathers of the Christian Church, to condemn excessive luxury; as it essentially would be bringing about the ruin of morals and the decline of States. It is rather strange that the unanimous sentiments of the men whose judgments we respect the most; in all other respects, no longer exert even a slightest influence on our opinions in this matter.

On this principle the third system was founded, adopted by Athens as well as by Sparta, by Rome in its heydays, and by virtually all the illustrious republics of antiquity. So that those who have no other revenue than work will find

sufficient demand for labor. The republic itself almost constantly occupied its citizens, and thus prevented them from privately offering their work for sale.

The legislators of antiquity, far from encouraging like ours do – the accumulation of fortunes and luxury; ensured inheritances to be shared equally among offspring, and so maintain a kind of equality between the patrimonies; especially suppress all habits of laziness or pomp, depriving its citizens of both the desire and opportunity to indulge in excessive consumption, to honor sobriety, simplicity, and abstinence. They wanted that, as each had its part to play in the activity of the body, each of them also had its part in the activity of the mind, and each its extent in the to be had pleasures.

To maintain this equal sharing, they diverted the citizens' manual labor, and let them devote only a small part of their time to agriculture, and to the arts and crafts; they summoned them instead onto the public square to deliberate, to the courts to judge; for instance at the Academy, and at the Portico, to sharpen their minds and elevate their soul by noble teachings;

at the theater, to train their taste and inspire them with the elegance of Attica; at the temples, to charm their imagination, and to make them unite the hopes of the future with the pleasures of life at present.

The application of improved mechanical arts to their industries gradually decreased the amount of labor required to support human life, but that was no reason for the social order to elevate the esteem of an individual who took it upon himself to rest, consume, and to enjoy for two, for four, for an order of magnitude, or two, or three, as compared to an average person; an individual who kept to himself the total profit, who even worked to reduce the share of workers, as the product increased. The increase in the value of output over the per unit input; or the economy achieved on the work of all, has to benefit all. Citizens of Athens were content, despite the advances in industry, with coats of the coarsest cloth, and bread with dried figs as their food. But still, the absence of all luxury had not destroyed the elegance of their spirits nor the delicacy of their taste.

By proscribing enjoyments, as a legislator, he had

71

not lost the activity and the spring of his character as a private man; and when the Athenian needed riches, not for himself, but for the motherland, the poor soil of Attica was sufficient for the provision of armaments for this republic, which made Asia Minor and Sicily tremble. It was enough to equip those colonies, which spread onto the most distant shores the very principles of a true civilization. The only luxury in Athens, were the men that the republic produced – happy the country that will be able to produce similar ones! Happy the world, if the freeing of Greece will soon revive such noble models!

It may be judged that we have moved too far away from the question discussed between Mr. Ricardo and this author, and that it would have been better to indicate what is remaining to be done, rather than what antiquity has done before us. But what remains to be done is a matter of infinite difficulty, which we have no intention of dealing with today. We would like to be able to convince economists as fully as we are ourselves, that their science is now on the wrong track.

But we don't have enough self-confidence to point out to them what the truth is. It truly is one of the biggest efforts that we could possibly set our mind to – that of how to conceive the actual organization of society. Who, however, would be the man bright enough to design such an organization that does not yet exist; so as to see the future, when we already have such a difficult time to see the present? However if all enlightened minds could finally agree, to seek what the guarantee would amount to, that society as a whole owes to the diverse classes responsible for nourishing it, and what one should not do because it hinders this objective, then perhaps a meeting of the brightest will be able to achieve that goal.

Let us therefore complete the analysis of the system in which we are at present, before thinking about what should replace it; let's study this path. Let's judge it, without being distracted by comparing it with a completely ideal theory. If I presented here what I would consider to be a remedy for

society's present ailments, a critic would abandon the examination or the appreciation of these current evils, to consider only my remedy, in all likelihood to condemn it for whatever reason, and the question of the balance of consumption with production would escape judgment. I will only allow myself to announce now, that supposing to have in mind

72

a fairly complete conviction of how to be able to obtain through legislation all the changes that I would like to see implemented, it still would not be complete enough to include nor exclude all possible events of impeding the progress in production, or insofar this would delay the application of the sciences to industry, and the invention of machines. My interest would only be looking for ways to ensure that the fruits of labor accrue to those who do the work, and allot machine output to the ones who operate these machines. If I finally do get the result I'm after, I would then rely on the best interest of producers not to engage in work for which there is no demand. So much as a producer can be considered to be a singular person, and that he thus be inspired by a single interest, he is invariably expected to be led by this proverbial maxim, that it is better to rest than to work for nothing. Also, all the facilities that will be allocated to his work, will never put him in the position of having to produce more than is asked of him; he will rest, and he will enjoy, when the work is done, whether he does it in twelve hours or two. It is, to the contrary, the opposing interests between the different producers who are in business doing the same kind of work, as well as between manufacturers and laborers, that solely account for over-saturated markets; the balance between them being distracted from another far more important balance – that being between producers and consumers. Manufacturers are determined to maintain a balance driven by competition, not because consumers ask them to do so, but because their workers offer them their inputs at a discount.

The task of re-associating the interests of those who contribute to the same kind of production, instead of putting them in an adversarial position with one another, belongs to the legislator. It is without doubt a difficult one; but I do not believe that it is as difficult as one might expect. A lot would have been accomplished already, if we prevented the legislation from acting in a direction diametrically opposed to the social interest. If we repressed all the laws

73

which countervail the division of inheritances, and which, favoring the formation or preservation of great fortunes prevents capital and land ownership from being distributed in smaller parts to those who exercise manual labor; if we removed all laws that protect organized coalitions of owners against workers, and all those that take away from workers their natural means of resistance (1). A feasibility study of laws which could oblige a boss to guarantee a fair subsistence to the worker that he employs, would take a long time, be difficult, and we will not start with considering

it at present. For now, all we need is to indicate that this is the area where we would want to seek a cure from the evils that society is suffering and from those which it is threatened by. While waiting for the time, which may very well be distant, when a confluence of economists' wishes will be able to indicate to a sovereign authority a change in its system of laws, it seems to us that the discussion we've just entered may well lead to some practical results in the future. We believe that in human society the ever growing demand for work is the constant, regular, and periodical result of human progress. This demand is, in turn, the beneficent cause of all new developments in industry, as well as that of the underlying science and technologies. When there is a request for a new work, i.e. a new means of paying for it, and a new need to consume it; all the progress that will cause society to meet this demand will be advantageous to all. On the one hand, there will be a call for an increase in the population; there will be more marriages, more children surviving at a young age, more activity in their later apprenticeships,

(1) As this first went to print I read in the papers that in MacClesfield the silk workers had been working only eleven hours a day, and when they found more work to do the working day was extended to twelve hours and one more hour was paid to them. On Saturday April 3, 1823 however, the manufacturers resolved to make work, starting from Monday, a regular twelve hour day, without paying more than the ordinary day. The workers resisted; martial law has been declared against them. What, however, was the motive of the masters? Price drop. Because they already had too many goods, they asked for more concessions from workers so that they could produce cheaper.

74

and more manpower employable for those who are already experienced. However, all these results are only successively obtainable, over a fairly long period of time, so as not to disturb a balance, nor to cause congestion. And the new population, which over the course of ten, fifteen, and twenty years, will enter working life, are going to be productive, not for doing the work requested today, but to benefit those for whom today's work will be enriching in the future.

On the other hand, there will be a call for an increase in the mechanical knowledge of man. The work required today can only be accomplished by men existing today; and so they must devote more hours each day to their work, so that they can support each other while some are making scientific discoveries that will allow all of them to produce more in the future than is being produced right now. Every increase in their productive powers, that is provided this doesn't exceed the measure of what those who demanded such labor can pay for and be consumed later; each increase, I'd say, will create new wealth, which in turn will generate requests for yet more. The wages of these workers, more skilled as well as more productive, will be high, their enjoyments will increase with their revenue; they will ask in turn that more workers work for them, or that the same do more work; because they will have the means to pay for this increase. The same sum that governs supply and demand for any new job will reappear in sequel contracts, reactivating all old work. Despite the progress in technology,

existing men will not suffice to do whatever is asked of them; new beings who will be born at that time will find, as they grow up, careers that await to be taken up. The population will increase, and agriculture will have to increase also to keep on feeding it.

All the movements of society are linked, they all result from each other, like the various movements of gears in a watch. But, as goes for a watch too, for this sequence of movements to be effective, the driving force must act where it is supposed to be acting; if, instead of waiting for the impulse

75

which must come from the demand for work, we think of being able to activate it through anticipated production, we do pretty much what we would do within a watch, if, instead of rewinding the gear that drives the regulator, we violently reverse another one; causing it to stop and break the whole instrument.

However, society participates in this inherent vital force with man who makes it triumph over partial disturbances, and self-repairs the harm it experiences. When in any branch of industry, the supply of products have exceeded demands, and the labor market is crowded with workers striving to change jobs, even change countries by emigrating, to finally adapt to their new situation; they almost always succeed in the longer or shorter term, provided that we won't be rushing the revolution that took place in mercantile interests. In a similar crisis, the prejudices that oppose the adoption of a new invention, communication or imitation difficulties, obstacles of any kind which seem to slow down the progress of science applied to the industrial arts, are all beneficial to mankind; they provide time, they allow the force to become vitalized and act; they give those who have been struck, time to recover from their bad injuries. These prejudices, which on many occasions are perhaps the surest guarantee of a society, generally present sufficient obstacles to damaging individual interest, so that the balance can be restored. It happens quite often no doubt that a manufacturing entrepreneur, in having invented a useful application of science, or discovered a practice that he thinks could be advantageous to foreigners, founds a new industry, and creates products that are not yet in demand. He then rests his hope that he will take away clients from one of the established factories, 'that it will spoil the business'; to use a technical expression, meaning, that it will spoil it for others, and he thus profits. There usually is a kind of balance between individual interests, which prevents one of them from fully upsetting everyone else. This inventor will do everything possible to keep his own secret and profit from it alone; but he will also experience the resistance of all his colleagues to whom he

76

strives to do wrong, that of all workers who understand well enough that their wages are going to decrease, that of all popular and local prejudices which always tend to push back on any innovations, and that of financial capitalists who do not willingly lend their money to enterprises they do not

understand and don't particularly want to either. But he will triumph over all these resistances, slowly, so as not to cause unnecessary upsets, giving the families he displaces time to settle down, to acquire a new livelihood, or even cultivate a new demand with consumers.

But the natural progress of industry generally isn't caused by private interests, as these are producing market congestion and condemning to idleness and starvation thousands of workers. This influence, is alien to personal interests at large; which, as we have seen, 'spoil' systematically and on a large scale 'the professions'. Sometimes governments are to blame, when wanting their nation to do whatever they saw happening all around them, put their industries up to producing goods for which there was no demand. And sometimes it was zealous citizens and scientists who believed that they could serve their homeland more usefully by importing as soon as possible all the inventions from abroad which were the wealth of other nations, attacking all local prejudices and reversing all its habits by quickly spreading all discoveries as far and wide as they could, while asking capitalists, on behalf of their patriotism, to finance a manufacturing operation that they wouldn't have obtained from them by just appealing to their interest.

For today, we will leave governments alone, for its existing policies have already given rise to several discussions earlier. Instead we will address only those of whom their perceived good doings had been leading them astray, when it made them favor their power of producing goods, that no one asked them to produce, over everything else. If we indeed managed to convince them that by having produced what isn't certain to be consumed, we may have brought them back to paying more attention to the principle on which is based; which is

their own system of political economy. They demand an absolute freedom for industry, because they believe that individual interests, compensating for each other, will merge into the general interest of all; so that they see that they themselves are to blame when this balance of individual interests becomes disturbed. And that, when creating a manufacture for the love of art or science, without researching the indications of market demand, often men and real interests become sacrificed to an abstract theory. It is the business of those in the know to always be on the look out for – progress in mechanics, chemistry, the study of nature, so as to meet all requests of the market. It is their business to be within reach of effectively supporting the work of man, at the moment when more powerful work is being asked of him. But, as long as the current organization of society lasts, as long as the existence of the poor is sacrificed to free competition, they should not put an additional weight in the balance, in favor of the overseers, against the workers. It must also be remembered that the fundamental maxim of the reigning school of economists is: 'let it happen and let it pass'; also leaving the generations made superfluous 'to pass away' their time. In another way, by the acceleration they put society through, with reckless zeal forcing it to adopt each discovery, they strike constantly, sometimes

on one class, sometimes on the other, and make society as a whole experience the constant suffering of change, instead of the benefit of improvements.

78

SECOND ESSAY

Social Revenue.

The first phenomenon which struck us in the revolution that the economic world is undergoing nowadays, affecting the changes in our habits and manners, is the disproportionate increase of production, an increase that is in no way determined by market demands; and the slowness, or difficulty, with which consumption successively applies to man's uses of the wealth that labor created for him. But from this first phenomenon we soon notice a coming into existence of a second, which deserves no less attention. It is the state of deception, and suffering, that industry undergoes when it has exceeded the needs of consumption. It is market congestion and the misery experienced, by all those who have contributed human labor, when they have produced too much wealth. The mere statement of this phenomenon seems to imply a contradiction: we are talking about an increase in products of human labor. For these products, as we are told, are wealth; how then can increasing wealth be a cause of poverty? We are talking about the reduction of consumers' means to get what they need. How can their means have diminished, while these same men, as producers, have more to give in exchange? The phenomenon however is certain, the fact is unmistakable; there is, or there may well be, market congestion, and when the produced goods cannot find their

79

flow into consumption, the entire trade is experiencing a great suffering. The truth of this fact will be confirmed regardless which merchant, or whatever industrialist one addresses; all will affirm the congestion of their markets. That the difficulty lies in selling, is at the same time the most frequent and the most formidable obstacle for commerce. And since the fact is certain, it cannot be contradictory; or rather, if a contradiction presents itself, it is in the terms that we employ our assumptions, or in the definitions we have adopted about phenomena, and not in the phenomena or things themselves.

We are proposing to avoid this difficulty by not starting with a definition of the words we use, or with the appreciation of the essence of things. We have spoken of wealth, value, production, consumption, without trying to define these words, because we could have only done so with using other words. We used them such as custom has given them to us, resigning ourselves to the likelihood that they left a little vagueness in the minds of

our readers. Before all, we have sought to clarify the ideas, and these in turn will settle the meaning of the words. If a more accurate analysis will make us run somewhere into a contradiction, it is not the underlying idea that must give way, but the word. It's in the definition, and not in the fact, wherein lies the defect of reasoning. It is for having followed the opposite course that science nowadays seems to debate against impossibilities. If instead of by considering wealth, production, consumption, and exchange abstractly, we can penetrate further into the organization of our society. If one carefully researches what the identity of a to be consumed product is, if one disentangles the various hands in which exchangeable things remain at any time, and if one seeks to know whether it is always those who still experience the need for things to trade; if we have these various men in their specific conditions, and not their wealth, constantly before our eyes, and even less the essence of wealth taken in the abstract, then we no longer will be stopped by the difficulties or the contradictions we created for ourselves, it will no longer be an impossibility to discern that extreme abundance

80

exists right alongside extreme need, and one will no longer deny, against the evidence, that market congestion and excess production can become a cause of general suffering. The social sciences consist of relationships too delicate to be able to be expressed numerically, and the interconnections of social life are too complicated to be considered abstractly – that is, without confusing dissimilar things, and pretending to be able to isolate a social position without distorting it and denature it.

The perception of abundance or deprivation, of wealth and of poverty, is sufficiently clear for each individual, according to the struggle to which each one is called to live; as this being the account of what is happening that perhaps occupies anyone's mind the most. But it was only with the greatest difficulty that one succeeds in generalizing this idea in order to apply it to an entire society. Indeed, each economist philosopher has given it a different definition. And then it has always been an abstraction, always an incomplete definition, and therefore false, of what constitutes wealth or the prosperity of a nation; leading to an eventual deception by each of the theoreticians in political economy. It was for having believed that gold and silver were the wealth of a nation, which our predecessors who invented the mercantile system, with its the balance in foreign trade, held onto; and, in the course of pursuing a false prosperity for society, was subjecting it to onerous regulations, prohibitions, and deprivations of all kinds. It was again for believing that the net produce of the land was wealth, that other philosophers invented the no less deceptive system of the physiocrats, and in which they endeavored to replace all taxes by what they called a direct tax. It is because governments today imagine that the national wealth consists of producing a lot and consuming little, with which they strive to give activity to industry and the export trade, while hampering imports. This is because economists these days imagine that wealth consists in indefinite increases in production and consumption of which

the latter, in their eyes, is the inevitable consequence of the former, that they refuse to see an ever increasing misery of the proletarian class, while the value of production and that of wealth increases.

The true reformer of our science, however, Adam Smith had given us another path. He had felt that our vision wasn't perceptive enough or understanding enough, to embrace the whole of society; he had felt that we always need to fix our eyes on a single object, to know it well, and he had undertaken to make us understand social organization, not by looking for attributes of society as a whole, and abstractly dealing with its works, trade, and wealth; but by constantly descending from society to man, and then taking him in his complex condition, in his interconnections with all his fellow creatures, and by being convinced that society is nothing but an aggregation of men and human fortunes, that which is the happiness of each one also constitutes the happiness of all.

We will follow the same method, the method of our master, in trying to understand the phenomenon that presented itself to us, the crowding of markets, and for finding a solution. We perceive well enough how applied work provides for the subsistence and enjoyment of the isolated man, or a family in isolation. We also realize very well that when everyone works for themselves, they do the thing they need, to the extent that it suits him. He does not proportion his production exactly to his consumption, because the provisions he manages to accumulate need to give him the sense of ease and abundance. If his provisions are overflowing, if they are lacking in usability and without having served a purpose, there is no doubt a little lost work, but no suffering will ever result because of it. The superfluous part alone, which had been produced in vain will have to be dispelled, but it was only because the rest of the production was found to be sufficient for the needs and enjoyments of the family. This state of isolation is not a fiction; on the contrary, it is the primitive state, almost the normal state of all emerging societies. We would observe this as a small nation entering the

progression of civilization, or better yet as a new colony. Society is made up of a number of scattered families on a given piece of land. Each family cultivates its portion for itself; each builds its cottage, clears part of its land, devotes the other to pasture, sows wheat, plants vegetables, and cultivates the fruits it can eat; each one spins and weaves its hemp and wool, and makes its own clothes; each one lives in abundance, without commerce; because one can hardly call by this name the exchanges which these families sometimes make among themselves of some part of their superfluity. Not only does this state of society exist; we could positively affirm that no colony, no new society would be able to succeed if it does not have its beginnings in this manner. The more complicated an economic organization we have in front of us, and where we are at now, in which

everyone's livelihood depends on trade and exchanges, is too artificially constructed for the emerging society not to run the daily risk of starving, or to be suffocated by revolutions in commerce, if it would be counting on that state of affairs to feed itself.

The progress of wealth in society, however, has brought conditions of sharing and that of professions; it is no longer the superfluous provisions of each that was the object of the exchanges, but the subsistence itself. Each worked to produce what seemed to him suitable to satisfy a need or to flatter a taste, not in any way for himself or his family, but that of the public; and he counted on the public paying him in return for his own subsistence. So in this new state of affairs, the life of every man who works and who produces does not depend on the completion and success of his work, but on its sale. It is of little consequence that the work in fact is good, it must be requested, it must be in an exact proportion to overall production. The producer who doesn't sell cannot live. And to be sure of selling, he would need to know two things, the most economical of which he can only have a very vague idea about, to wit: what is the quantity of the thing he produces that the public needs, and what is the quantity that can be produced by all those who do the same job as him. It is not given to him to arrive at

83

a very exact appreciation of these two quantities; and so, his livelihood which depends on his sales is always precarious. The need of a consumer, or an increased demand however, for him is the symptom of prosperity; while on the contrary, an overabundance of production, or the congestion of markets, is for him a sure sign and the precursor of misery. But what is it that regulates this demand? Why is this demand, which for some articles he even has himself and that he satisfies with others, of such great importance? It is here, again, in our desire to take a general view of society, that we have gone astray. We believed, one after the other, that it were precious metals in circulation, that it was the land's net product, and that it even was production itself, which formed the measure of demand. While each man appears consecutively to us as functioning in his capacity as buyer and as seller, as producer and consumer; it is impossible for us, from within their intersecting and complicated movements, to disentangle and perceive the general movement; it is impossible for us to appreciate the needs of society in an abstract way, or what powers are involved that will satisfy it. For that we need to descend again into the embrace of family units, study how its consumption is regulated in each of them, and recognize what the limits of demand are, and what factors prevent it from being more considerable.

There we will soon recognize that for every man, for each family head, the most important point of view under which wealth presents itself is that of revenue.

The measure of his consumption is his revenue. The first thing he should know is, according to the popular phrase: how much does this man have to eat per year or day? All other notions relating to his wealth can still remain

confusing to him; he may only have a very vague idea of the value of his capital, or his home, or his land. He even knows that his assessment of these can change considerably, without affecting their condition; while the first thing he lays out

84

clearly in his mind, is that there is a certain portion of his goods that he can consume without becoming poorer; because, by continuing to live as he lived, to work as he has been working, this portion of his property will be reproduced daily or periodically, and he will be able to start consuming it again in the same space of time. He also recognizes that there is another portion of what he owns that he cannot touch without him rushing to his demise. He therefore distinguishes his revenue from his property, and he calls revenue his periodical gain, happening to him from somewhere. We assign the designation of revenue here in the broadest possible sense, and understand under this name not only the annuity of land or capital loaned, or houses rented out, but also the profits of industry, all merchandising, all agriculture, wages and emoluments in 'return' for labor on goods and services, both public and private. Only the head of any family, if he is poor, is in the practice of estimating his daily revenue; he knows what he can eat each day, that is, what he can consume, what he can spend, without getting poorer. On the contrary, if he is rich or only if he is a farmer, he contemplates his periodical revenue, because for the latter and in general it is only with every marketed harvest that he receives it all at once. Nations are only aggregations of individuals; what is true of everyone is true of all. The consumption of any nation, a consumption at least which can continue year after year, without impoverishing it, without ruining it, is no other thing than the combined consumption of each of its members, such as anyone can do without exceeding their revenue. The essential point of the administration of any private wealth, concerns the ratio of revenue to expenditures; it must still also be the essential point of the governance of the public fortune. If the first question people ask is always: "How much does this man have to eat per year or per day?" This should still be the first question in political economy: How much does this nation have to eat

85

per year or per day? The answer to this question must in fact depend on the discernment of the expenditure or consumption that it can undertake, without disturbing or ruining itself. It is this consumption, or the revenue⁸ which is the measure of it, that

⁸ Translator's note: here we hit upon the reason why throughout this work, Sismondi's term 'revenu' has basically been left untranslated (revenue). A translation in the form of received *income* carries an entirely different meaning; and Sismondi would have been regressing from having a deduced dynamic theory, to a semi-induced protoKeynesian comparative-static non-theory. What Sismondi didn't realize however is that, by going the correct route he took, he was left with no choice but conceding all his values to be

reproduction must be regulated; insofar we want each producer to find a buyer for his work, so that the market where he operates does not become encumbered. And that the element of wealth, with which this work has become imbued, does not become a cause of ruin for him, when society determines it be gotten rid of. So everything within the social organism is really linked to the maintenance, that is to say the increase or decrease, in social revenue.

As far as private wealth is concerned, revenue is the only reasonable measure of expenditure or consumption. Everyone knows very well that one will run to one's ruination, if one consumes all that one owns as if it were one's revenue. Everyone calls only the sum of enjoyments for which revenue can suffice – ease, and sees only a dissipation in the pleasures that exceed the means of each, and which will bring to oneself – an inevitable misery. It is the same with a nation or with the whole human of society. Its wealth is only the aggregation of all private fortunes, its capital is the capital of all, its revenue is everyone's revenue. So it is as true of a nation as of an individual, that, if it eats its capital alongside revenue, it will run to its ruin; and that the amount of his consumption only indicates an ease, in as much as we can be assured that there is no squandering, while its spending never overrides revenue.

Every head of a family knows that it can only get rich by economy, that is by adding a part of its periodical revenue to its capital. He also knows that he does not enrich himself and his family by the sole production of the fruits of his industry, if his earnings do not increase at the same time with his work; he knows that there can be a profitable production, but also one that is not. The shoemaker knows that if he made a hundred pairs of shoes last year, on each one earning him 6 francs; and two hundred pairs this year, on each of which he earns 3 francs, his revenue has remained the same, and his work is doubled. So that

86

the increase in his production was not profitable to him. And that if on each of those two hundred pairs, he earned only 2 francs, he sees that his work has doubled and his revenue has decreased by a third. It can be the same with a nation. Production, without any added consumption, is not a certain sign of prosperity; the latter only increases if the earned revenue has increased too.

Any head of a family is more or less aware of the difference between real profits and uncertain profits, like the gains had while the game is still ongoing. He only counts the first as part of his revenue, and rejects the latter as brought among the lucky chances, whose return is not assured to him as yet. Real profit does not cost anybody anything; whoever pays it finds it is advantageous, just like the one who receives it. Such is the

statically indeterminate. He did come awfully close though when in his 1803 book, after having devised equations in algebraic notations of (lagged) aggregate revenue and savings, vowed to never use these again. Something essential, he thought, was missing; but wasn't able to put his finger on it. Post-Keynesians however, basically using the same period-analysis equations, still think they're onto something...

increase in quantity that a farmer obtains from land through agriculture, when he sows a sack of grain, that lets him harvest five; or a quality improvement which is obtained by industry, when with a ball of yarn a piece of cloth is made; or the greater convenience is got by commerce, when collected salt from the seashore is brought to urban places. But the randomly uncertain profit, the profit of the game, means a loss for the one on whom it is made. The player either on cards, or on public shares of stock, or on commodities, knows very well that he only gets rich at the expense of the one he deals with; that in this fact there is no increase in fortune, but a simple displacement of it. He understands, which is not at all important to him, that although the profits of his game will add to his own revenue, they add nothing to that of the nation, for they must be deducted from the revenue of his opponent. But the head of a family understands better, because he is more interested in granting a trust to the one who makes real profits; which he refuses to the player. Because either he plays with equal chances and he must lose as often as he wins; or he plays with an unfair advantage, and he's a scoundrel. This man already understands, or he will learn from experience, that one who successively pursues uncertainties loses all the essential qualities of administering a fortune well. Unsure of the future

that person will seek all his pleasures in the present; he does not distinguish his capital from his revenue, because he really hasn't got any revenue. He puts no wisdom in foresight either, for he really has no future. For a nation, even more so than for an individual, the distinction between real profit and uncertain profit is important. Its revenue arises from the first alone, the second presents both positive and negative quantities which cancel each other out; but the second simultaneously spreads among the population, vices which destroy its industry and its foresight, and which almost as certainly will lead it to its ruin as the dissipation of its capital. Every prospective family head should know that on his revenue he must pay the formation and growth of his family; he knows he must not take a wife, if he has no food for her as well as for himself; that he should not want children, if he does not have sufficient revenue to share it with them all, if he is not convinced that he will leave in his wake a revenue that is up to the task. The most vehement passions that enter a man's heart can doubtlessly delude him; but the more that his revenue can be ascertained with precision, the more he will be stripped of any random chance, the less possible that his passions will delude him. Every worker knows without doubt that his children, when they are born, will not only be unable to earn anything for several years, but that they also will prevent their father and mother from spending all their time at work, and that parenting will thus decrease revenues accordingly. No family can grow without increasing expenses, nor reducing the means of making them. However if the father of the family can suffice without touching his capital, he sacrifices other pleasures to those of paternity. If he is certain of finding a profitable state for his children, as soon as their strength comes to them, he sees his tiny

domestic society growing without anxiety. The education of his children is like a savings bank for him, he places his savings that he capitalizes, and which will one day give him a revenue. But if, on the contrary, he notices that his yearly gain falls short of his needs, if moreover he recognizes that the job

88

is the wrong one, and that he will not be able to assure to those little beings, who are so dear to him, enough revenue in exchange for their being; the birth of each new child is a calamity for him. If he is in a true ease, he will be careful not to expose himself to such an eventuality; but if he is in one of those unfortunate positions where men cannot secure their future revenue; if he is dependent on circumstances over which he has no control, due to this terrible game that society at times plays at the expense of the poor; still, most of the time he doesn't worry about it, and he lets untimely deaths mend the excess of births.

Revenue is the limiting measure of population growth, for society as well as for the family. Revenue is the measure of everyone's livelihood and well-being, revenue as a whole is the measure of the livelihood and comfort of all. The greater the number of young children in the nation, in proportion to the total number of its population, the greater its spending increases and its revenue decreases. The more, on the contrary, it contains individuals from twenty to fifty years old, in proportion to its total population, the greater is its power of performing work. The population however increases every time that work is rewarded, which over time increases the revenue of the working class. So there are more births, with the fathers making advances in the education of their children, in the hope for a happy future. There is also more longevity throughout the working class; because ease is a cause of health, and ease is the fruit of the work carried out.

But if, on the contrary, the revenue decreases while the work increases; if in particular wages fall; and if the poor, to recover from the quantity, strive to do more work, wearing themselves out by working too hard and by a state of privation; dying young, or languishing in sickness; the number of able-bodied men will decrease significantly. Maybe the number of births also decreases, if prudent habits and order prevail in the nation; or perhaps to the contrary it will increase, if man degrades enough to think only of the present moment, and with brutal appetites.

89

Thus we see the disposition to drunkenness increase with indigence; but children are the first victims of poverty; the more are born, the less will survive; just as the more we manage to preserve, the less will be born. The population stats may in this case be maintained, maybe even rise, despite the decrease in revenue, but the population of virile age will decrease, the chances of life will decrease, and this large number of births which one often notices as a sign of prosperity, will only indicate the great number of

those who are born to die, without having known the sweets no more than the duties of life.

Malthus had assigned the terminal of subsistence as the outer limit of the population. The human race, he said, grew in a geometrical progression, and the subsistence in an arithmetic progression: humanity therefore was on an unstoppable march towards a terrible famine. There is no doubt that there are limits beyond which subsistence could no longer increase in a geometric progression; and that there are even limits beyond which it could not increase at all; but we are still at an infinite distance from these bounds. There is room on earth for an immense development of culture, and all of its products that we use for our subsistence, animals and plants alike, are multiplying geometrically infinitely faster than man. The latter is indeed endowed with a faculty of multiplication too and could double or quadruple every twenty-five years; sharing this faculty with all of organic nature. But, among all animals and all plants, human kind is still the least affected. Man is not destined to make habitual use of this faculty, and he won't normally. It is only in rare cases, after a great destruction of the population, or after human beings are transplanted to virgin land, where a great need for work arises, a great revenue is born from this work; and the population quickly proportions itself to it, because the lives of those who would have died in misery is preserved in ease.

90

As soon as the level is restored, the population only increases in the normal slower manner, and its very slowness is most often a clue of great prosperity. Where the average life is the longest; where everyone who is born has the greatest chance to reach old age; there too, as in Geneva, the number of births is close to being perfectly equal with that of the dying. Here as well, the number of marriages are proportionally the greatest, with most individuals participating in the duties, the virtues, and happiness of marriage, and with each marriage producing fewer children. In Geneva the average is below three, two children represent the father and mother, and will collect the revenue that sufficed for their parents; the fraction, below unity, of the third, represents individuals who will not reach the age of marriage, or who die in celibacy. The subdivision legacies with which English economists constantly threaten us is unknown there; because the population, this being proportional to its revenue, maintains itself in an always stable ease. Or perhaps, it is always slightly increasing, without it being possible to say whether its progression is geometric or arithmetic.

The law that Malthus had assumed, with its two progressions, one being geometric, the other arithmetic, and the danger of famine with which he threatened mankind, would therefore not find its application in all but the most hypothetical of times; and one which the human race will probably never see coming about.

While it is today, that it is every day, that the increase in the population must be measured with the increase in its means of existence. When it is hurting, it is not because wheat and meat are in short supply at the market,

but because the masses can't afford to buy those items. When the people are in ease, it is not because any new foods are displayed for sale in front of them, but because their revenue is sufficient to order in greater quantity what is required. Malthus himself, though he only expressed this material and gross limit of subsistence, the only condition to which his theorem of the two progressions could relate, seems to be displaying a vague notion of population with revenue proportionality; for he explained that by subsistence he understood all the needs of man according to his condition, without paying attention to the fact that the products of human industry

91

grow in a much faster geometric progression than the human population. But if revenue is the measure of everyone's ease and prosperity, if it is the regulator of consumption, if it is the regulator of the population, how could it have happened that Malthus never expressed it, that none of the economists signaled its importance, and hardly ever mention its name? How can we explain this oversight, as Adam Smith, the true renovator of this science, owed all the progress he made to it due to the care he always took in comparing private wealth with public wealth; only to the judicious application of all the rules of the domestic economy to all problems of political economy. It is that all dogmatic writers, all those who endeavor to elevate a system as absolutely true, need to tie it to some striking idea that is easily accepted by all; and that the idea of social revenue, of this power which gives impetus to the whole social mechanism, becomes ever more confused in their eyes, the more they try to fix it. It escapes them by the infinite multiplicity of its relations, by its continual transformation, by the daily exchanges which take place, either in production or in consumption, of the revenue of one against the capital of another agent. So that the philosopher-economist, looking at all social wealth, can never say: this object is capital, this other one is revenue, without someone being ready to answer him: what you call capital is my revenue; what you call revenue is my capital. This impossibility of finding in material objects a definite character, which puts them in one or the other class; this need to consider the division as abstract, and as only existing in everyone's opinion, made it more convenient to deny its existence entirely, and to be concerned only with society's production, instead of with its demand enabling revenue, or that of its consumption in

92

place of its expenditures. However the daily experiences should teach us that a nation, as well as an individual, sometimes sees his ease decrease while simultaneously its production capacity increases; that sometimes the increase in consumption, far from being an expense, is a means of good fortune. And that the goods of which it is making use are reproduced with so much abundance, that when it becomes consumed, capital is being amassed as well.

The recent sufferings of society cannot really be fully understood, and so it won't be possible to provide a remedy, as long as we focus on the division of capital and revenue; despite those notions being abstract and elusive. It is useless to open savings banks to the people, if we do not make sure beforehand that there is indeed a revenue that can be saved. It is useless to work on improving education and skills development, if one doesn't make sure beforehand that the time needed to do so isn't all forcibly taken up by generating revenue, and so leaving the recipient little rest for thought, and little vigor for trying out new things. It is useless to push society to engage in new production, if we have not made sure that the effort of production will be engender a new revenue fully commensurate with the demand for its output. It is useless to open an import-export business with foreigners, if one hasn't made sure that by selling to foreigners one's revenue will be increased, and that by buying from foreigners, savings to be made on part of one's revenue will not destroy some other, more important, home-grown revenue. Population, production, consumption, accumulation, prosperity, misery, everything is linked to revenue, and everything is explained by an understanding of it.

What, however, is social revenue, we will ask again? It is the sum of all the revenues of each individual. But how much is this sum? That we don't know. Of what material part of our wealth does it consist? We don't know that either. We can only capture this revenue in the hands of each; recognize it only in the account that everyone does for themselves.

Science points out mysteries that it does not succeed in clarifying, the administration is reduced to conjecture when it cannot arrive at an exact calculation. Besides,

93

whenever it comes to public wealth, where so many positive or negative quantities balance only imperfectly, where the very notion of value has received so many different definitions, where the cost price, the market or competition price, the estimated price in days of work, in subsistence and in cash, constantly confuse so many opposing ideas, that we never can arrive at an inventory that is expressible by numbers, to a quantity that is other than conjectural.

The mercantile system made the wealth of a nation lie in the gold and silver it possessed, and that, according to its promulgators, it was constantly accumulating; the system of the physiocrats recognized as wealth only the goods of the Earth. Both were victoriously refuted by Adam Smith, however, both still retain an influence in the minds of many; because to the question: what is wealth? they answered, true enough, in a wrong way, but positive and one that sticks easy to one's mind; while Adam Smith could only answer with a list of incomplete and vague explanations, and the idea of which soon fades away, even after it has been well understood.

Public wealth, according to Adam Smith, is all that constitutes the prosperity of each; houses, fields, equipment, tools, cattle, man himself with skills he has acquired and his ability to work; then all the products of

man's industry, even though a few are so fugitive that they are in no way susceptible to accumulation. This enumeration of wealth seems very vague; and yet it is clear enough to dispel several errors. Comparing and evaluating all these various goods that everyone has with the quantity of gold and silver coins, we recognize that cash makes up a very small part of both private and public wealth.

It is also soon recognized that the claims of an individual on another are not part of the public wealth; because these are of positive and negative values, they cancel each other out. Public funds also disappear, because they are claims of lenders on the property of taxpayers.

94

Paper money disappears as well; since it is only a promise to redeem in precious metal coins, or a hypothetical claim on the precious metals in circulation. This single inventory of public wealth, vague as it is, is enough to dispel the error of those who attribute economic power to the creation of credit, while it is only indicating the disposition of one good for the other, without augmenting either its quantity or its creative potency. Listing everyone's revenue may be more vague still, yet this also may be sufficient to dispel several illusions.

Either man devotes his work to agriculture or he does so to the industrial arts. Whether he makes the earth bring forth fruits, or whether he gives these fruits a shape more suitable for human uses, his work increases the value or quantity of the materials on which work is exerted. He makes it his wealth, and this wealth is of greater value than the advances made during the work process. The superiority of the periodical product of man's work on his periodical advances includes society's revenue; but this added value has two different evaluations, one, according to how much the work has cost, and the other, according to the need felt by those who will obtain it for their own use.

When a family lives completely isolated; regardless of its size, it is always driven by a common interest which always proportions its work to the needs of each of its members. There is never any work that is done without being called for, or, without its final result having been determined. Since no trades are contemplated, there is no numerical price. And yet the idea of revenue develops there much more clearly than in our complicated societies, where they abandoned idea of giving a special guarantee to the general interest, and where, pitting individual interests against society's exchanges as a whole, they flattered themselves that this would achieve the same goal.

Within this isolated family, which we are supposing to be large, we had no trouble in recognizing the need for a determined amount of food, clothing, and furniture.

95

These family members already had materials, provisions, tools, and products of their previous labors; some of which can be considered as

capital that they have accumulated, such as wheat for seeds, fleeces of which they want to make cloth, the equipment and tools they will use; while some others are revenue of the previous period, which they will consume in the process of creating the revenue of the new one. These would be their food and the clothes with which they cover themselves. The members of this family get to work, they share their work, they plow and they sow, they prepare the hides for leather, they weave the woollens, and finally they gather and accomplish everything for the necessary supply that will serve them for the coming period.

In this procurement of prosperity, we recognize three parts: one is capital, it is the restitution of the advances which had been made for agriculture or industry, the sowing of the plowman, the fleeces and the hemp of the weaver; the other precipitates in the nature of capital and revenue, it is the subsistence of the family during any period of work, the food it eats, the clothes it wears. This was revenue as the product of the previous period, but as an accumulated product, which must always at least be the same quantity at the beginning of each period, to start work again; and so, to the extent that this could be productive, it was capital. Finally the third part is purely revenue; it is the material quantity by which the periodical product has surpassed that of the previous one, or the profit from work.

We see that even in the simplest state of society, revenue retains something of its mysterious and elusive nature, it is converted into capital, capital is consumed as a revenue. It's like oxygenated blood feeding a human body, which thereby is converted into its substance, and yet is constantly reborn. In this condition, however, some of society's laws are perceived more clearly than when the complication has increased. We recognize that the product of labor is more considerable, when the methods of production are improved, or as the machines become better; but we also sense that any increase in

product is not necessarily profitable. The needs of society are limited; whatever it cannot consume is useless to it. The amount of food that a given number of individuals can consume is soon reached. Therefore there would be a loss of work applied to increase it, and all the superfluity of nourishing work should only be used to increase the quality, and not the quantity; so as to make food either healthier or more delicate, or both. The amount of clothing, a given number of individuals requires, is a little less precise; although the same clothes may well be enough to last for a year, it can be pleasant to replace them for new ones – four times, eight times if you want, per year, so that the same garment needs to last only six weeks. But that would be the limit; any clothing that would be produced beyond that would involve useless labor, with no benefit to society, and without revenue creation. If the power to produce always increases, because of the improvement of skills and machinery, the time soon arrives when ceasing quantity becomes the order of the day, and it gives way to perfecting the quality. There is not one single product of human labor to which this rule does not apply. At the same time, the improvement of

quality also has its limits; as these are posed by the work itself that society calls it to do. All these luxury productions can only be enjoyed as long as leisure time is available; being useless otherwise. Thus production has limits which is prescribed not to be exceeded. It is only by containing oneself within these limits that an increase of its productive power is advantageous. The quantity must be regulated by the number of the population, the quality by available leisure time. When man succeeds in appealing for help from science; when advances in technology allow him to accomplish infinitely more work in infinitely less time, it also becomes necessary for him to suspend his productivity powers indefinitely, and that he reserves to himself much more leisure times; because the expensive clothes, exquisite food, and all highly perfected works, are for leisure use only.

97

These are rules that we understand, and can see clearly in the family, however numerous it may be supposed to be; but these are equally valid in any state of a society, although it is no longer run by an intelligence that understands all the relations of its members with each other, and by a will that makes them all work together for the common good. Individual interests have severed the bond that used to unite them. They have been encouraged, with the help of exchanges and cash, to fulfill separately what they are after, without worrying in the least about the common good. And they have all found themselves in conflict with each other. Only laissez-faireists have found it more convenient to say and believe that their own reciprocal opposition to the idea of a common good contained all people as well, as they tended by their combined action towards the advantage of all as if they really had it in sight.

The interest of production has been considered independent of the interest of consumption; and this production interest has itself divided into a large number of rivaling interests. Those who happened to have on hand a certain amount of accumulated wealth have generally been charged with periodical production; and they were divided into two classes to look after – agriculture, or some other industry. They said to the farmer: hand over to us the use of your land, your buildings, and all your improvements. We will direct the work, and, on their product, we will reserve for you an always equal portion, a lease fee or rent; and this will be your revenue. They said to the plowman: let us take the lead in your work, we will be responsible for collecting the fruits; but while before you needed to wait for them, we will pay you, day after day, a wage that we will take out of our capital and that will form your revenue; we will advance, on our expense, new capital for various improvements; the product of your work will be more considerable than if you had directed it by yourself; but that will be our profit. Thereafter came the government and the Church, with levies on rents, wages, and profits, a new sharing arrangement of the bulk of production, that they redistributed as revenue to all classes of public servants. At the same time other capitalists undertook the management of industry, and they assured a wage to the workers, a rent to the owners of

factories and machines, interest to other capitalists who are content to lend them

98

capital without wanting to go to any trouble of actually producing; and finally they pay taxes to the government, charging of course a profit for themselves; they are thus the distributors of a periodical revenue to four or five classes of people; but this revenue, either in the fields or in the city is never something else than the surplus of the value of the labor produced on the advances that were made to produce it.

If the work had been done in concert with those who must consume it, production would always have been proportionate with demand. But the more commerce expanded, the more exchanges between distant countries increase, the more impossible it becomes for producers to measure exactly the market needs that they must meet. Besides, they hardly give it any thought; each thinks only of himself, and instead of wondering if his efforts will actually increase social revenue, he only works to secure an ownership of the largest share at the expense of all others. And often, as a means to achieve this in the shortest time possible, this is by reducing the share of all others involved.

The capitalist, as entrepreneur in an industry, would see with certainty his revenue increasing, if consumer demand for the products of that industry, increased in the market he supplies; but this increase, if common to all of society, is singularly slow and gradual. In order for there to be a greater demand for those goods, this cannot be counteracted upon by a greater number of births. Because this circumstance, as considered by itself, being accompanied by an increase in needs expenditure and a decrease in gain, would cause the population as a whole to feed itself worse, and most children will die at an early age. Instead it is necessary to increase ease, and especially for the poor; because food accounts for three quarters of the expenses the poor have, while it barely makes up a tenth of a rich man's expenses.

99

An increase in affluence will prolong the life of the poor, and will be the cause of more children surviving into adulthood. All the time, in the countries where the population is growing the most rapidly, either by births or by longevity, it has never been seen, except in Ireland, as also in some colonies, to double in a century; despite we sometimes calculate that if it continued to grow on the basis of any last few years, it would double in much less time.

Generally, in truly prosperous countries, it does not increase other than in a sensible way. Its progress, however, is set by the limit that agriculture must impose on the production of food substances. Leaving aside the oscillations in good and bad harvests, which compensate for each other, it must not increase the quantity of food by more than one percent per year, since this is about the fastest progress that we see in Europe's happy

population; and as each improvement in agriculture provides a much larger and faster production, each of them must be followed in turn by the abandonment of the crops that give the largest volume of food substances. From a number of potato fields, for example, to producing wheat; of wheat fields, to producing meat or fermented drinks; or of fields cultivated with non-food substances to produce flax, hemp, madder for dye – all the raw materials for urban industries. This is indeed what generally happened, except that several substances, first cultivated for human use were later intended for domesticated animals: which amounts to the same result. In remote districts, which don't have much contact with their neighbors, the amount of food substances that can be consumed each year is well enough known by the grower; so that he does not cultivate and throw on the market a quantity of substances that he isn't fairly certain to sell. But when the farmer is within easy reach of a city, seaport, canal, railway, or finally, any kind of market of which he can in no way calculate the extent, he no longer cares about limiting his crops at all. If he can, he doubles and

100

quadruple his crops; and expects to sell them by offering them at a little lower price than other producers. In order to do so, he begins by striving to reduce the revenue of those who work with him in production: pay less in rent to the owner, less interest to the one who lent him money, less wages to the workers, less government taxes. By dumping excess wheat on the market that it cannot sell, this necessarily produces that effect; for wheat immediately drops in price. All the farmers then feel justified in making the same complaint; as he does to the owner, to the capitalist, to workers, and even to his overlord. Rents fall, interest on money falls, wages are reduced, and tax collectors may give in also.

He reacts simultaneously against all the other farmers. If his cultivation methods are better, with the same work and the same advances, it can produce a greater quantity of food, and he can still gain at a price where others lose. So he keeps getting richer, while his competition ruins itself. He then offers to take over their property with his own farm, and he finds capitalists who facilitate this bloodletting. His overseeing work will not double when even his administration will be doubled. Moreover, he is worth more by earning 4 percent on two hundred thousand francs than 5 percent on one hundred thousand. And the result has been that small farms have been disappearing; we are only seeing very large farms nowadays. So all revenue from the land has decreased by this exaggerated production. The owner has consented in lowering rents; the capitalist became satisfied with an interest of 4 instead of 5 percent; the farmer, with a profit of 4 instead of 5 percent; the day laborer, with a wage of twenty cents instead of thirty cents a day. All of these people however, are consumers of food, and under this common denominator they make up the largest share of consumption. For each of them, the decrease in revenue will be followed by a decrease in consumption, either in quantity, or in quality. The poor will need to give up meat for bread, and then bread for the potato. The effect for the rich will be more complicated however; the consequence of

their decrease in revenue, is that more capital is needed to live, more land is needed to get the same rent, more money needs to be ready for lending to draw the same interest,

101

larger farms for the same profit to be cultivated. And since the rich always take great care not to let their families down, and not to engage in reckless marriages, we will also see the number of formerly rich people decrease; the number of old nobility families has in fact, and with each generation, decreased everywhere, consequently lowering inheritances. As a result, the consumption of the rich class taken as a whole will decrease; not only according to the proportion of a decrease in revenue, but also according to the decrease in the affected number of people. This double negative effect is very apparent in England, although the number of careers which are open there to the gentry class perhaps still maintains a greater number of wealthy families than anywhere else; the total number of landowners have very noticeably decreased, and that of active farmers have declined even more. The quantity of wheat, meat, and good beer consumed by them, had to decrease too; and as for the common day laborers, they are back down from meat to bread, and from bread to potatoes; their consumption having decreased both in quantity and quality.

We have rather focused on the agricultural sector, because the relationship between production and consumption is more easily grasped there; but the same things are happening in precisely the same way in the manufacturing industries.

Thus, for there to be a greater demand for clothes, it isn't necessary either that there are more births, but that there is more ease among those who have to wear clothes; that there is more revenue available among all the classes of the nation, because all of them use part of their revenue to dress. The increase in births may well only lead to an increase in the number of deaths, and not change anything in consumption patterns of all kinds. The increase in vitality, in prolonging adult life, the time when the most is spent

102

on clothes, sensibly has a much greater influence. However, as we have seen before, neither the multiplication of births, nor longevity, anywhere will near double the population in a hundred years. Ease will advance the consumption of clothes much more quickly, and especially the ease of the poor.

There is a lot of benefit for health, cleanliness, and for enjoyment reasons, to change clothes frequently. The sultanas of greater Mongolia made it a point of honor to tear up their garments every evening, so as not to wear them for more than a single day. Maybe women in Europe use up to thirty dresses each year; which is probably the highest consumption which may be determined on a whim; but as for taking care of hygiene or cleanliness, an average of four new garments per year for each individual is probably

the highest level which national consumption can reach. As soon as the manufactures will arrive at producing this amount of fabric, they cannot go usefully beyond. They then need to focus on quality and no longer on quantity; so that they vary the type of fabrics, their finesse, their elegance, and then finally that they stop; that all redundant hands be employed in something other than fabrics' manufacturing, or that its workers perish in misery. However, the increase in manufactured products proceeds at a pace that is almost infinitely faster than what is happening in agriculture. Their types of machines, with a given amount of work, easily doubles the output in a year, even quadruples them, and at times even increasing it tenfold. The amount of fabric that is enough to dress the entire world was soon produced; and another milestone in improving quality, at least for all working men, is soon reached also. Work is incompatible with clothes, both of great finesse and of great elegance. For workers the most esteemed qualities of clothing are wearability and durability; but these qualities even dispenses with renewing them often and so decrease its consumption. As in regards to the substitution of cotton for wool fabrics, this presents in no way an increase in consumption; on the contrary, it is a decrease when

the first fabric costs less in the way of applied labor to produce than the second one.

But the manufacturer, just like the gentleman farmer within reach of a large city, does not know his market; and he gets lost in a similar haze. He imagines that buyers, for all intents and purposes, are limitless; without worrying at all about losses for his rivals, he thinks up ways of attracting customers to him. He thinks he is patriotic when he does not ruin, by the development of his own industry, anyone else but foreign manufacturers; which he then takes pride in. But the truth of this action is that he does not spare any business of his compatriots either. All his work, and all his skill, consists in supporting them; sometimes by substituting some imperfect machine, with a more expensive, but more productive one, than those that were already in use before; sometimes by obtaining a discount on the rent of buildings, on the rent of capital, and thus reducing the revenue of the idle rich; sometimes by reducing the wages of his workers and the revenue of the working poor; sometimes in reducing the profit of his own industry, which he can do profitably if he pursues it on a larger scale; sometimes by seducing the tastes of consumers by offering new products, by inventing new fashions for instance. So he increases his production by reducing the revenue of capitalists, factory owners, manufacturers, his colleagues, and of himself, and finally of all his workers. For many though, this operation is fatal. When he increased his periodical production from one hundred thousand francs to a million, he killed, at a hundred thousand francs each, the nine manufacturers, his rivals who competed with him. And when he reduced the wages of his own workers, or he had caused those of his rivals to be dismissed altogether, he caused the weakest among them and their children to perish in misery, and soon after that most of the others too. His prosperity is disastrous to things as well as to men. His new factory, with

its new machinery, made all the old facilities of its rivalry, useless and ruined, and all the capitals that had established it were wiped out. There is a loss in revenue for society: by a decrease in the interest of money, by the decrease in its industry, by the loss of rent for all factories,

104

and of all the machines no longer needed, by the reduction of the total number of workers and the wages of each.

There is therefore a decrease in the consumption of all these classes; and while the manufacturer works with all his might to increase the number and improve the quality of the fabrics he exhibits for sale, he works just as actively, and just as effectively, to reduce the number of buyers one way or the other, and thereby decide for all those who are getting poorer to use their clothes longer, and to be content with ever grosser qualities.

We would tire the reader in vain by reasoning in the same way about the manufacture of all other industrial products, utensils, furnishings, and even weapons. Everywhere we would find that consumption cannot exceed a certain limit, difficult to trace without doubt, but nevertheless certain; and that as soon as production exceeds it, this exuberant production, far from increasing revenue, decreases it; and that from then on the increase in apparent material wealth, only produces an increase in superfluity and concomitant misery for all of society.

We believe, by this analysis of social revenue, to have by now sufficiently responded to the difficulty that we raised before; we believe to have made it abundantly clear how there can be too much, even of the best things.

Indeed, work is a very good thing, but there may also be too much work offered, if it exceeds the demand for output, if it thus lowers the wages, and if it consequently reduces a worker's revenue. Capital is a good thing too; but there may be too much capital, if it is the capitalist who pushes for more production, and not the consumer who asks for it. So that, in fact, the production is greater than the value of the revenue which must buy it. For this disproportion lowers the price of everything that one wants to sell, and consequently further decreases the revenue of all those having something to sell also. The owners of these revenues however, are in turn consumers, and the loss they will experience will make them all the more unable to buy the next periodical production.

105

And finally, production itself is a good thing, but there may be too much production too; either due to the superabundance of labor, or to that of capital, or to the too powerful assistance that science has given to the industrial arts. Because when production isn't being regulated by the desires of consumers, and by the available means of satisfying them, the measure of which being their revenue, production remains unsold thereby ruining its producers.

Other propositions are the result of what we have just outlined, and these contradict the established doctrines as well. It isn't true that the struggle of

individual interests suffices to promote the greatest good of all. As well as that the prosperity of the family requires that, in the mind of its head, its expenditures must always be proportionate to its revenue, and also that production is adjusted to the needs of consumption. From the perspective of public wealth, it is imperative that the sovereign authority supervises and always contains special interests in order to make them tend to the general good; that this authority never loses sight of the formation and distribution of revenue, for it is this revenue that must spread ease and prosperity among all classes; that it takes under its protection the poor and hardworking class in particular; for it is the one least able to defend itself, is the quickest sacrificed by all the others, and whose sufferings form the greatest national calamity; finally, that it isn't the rapidity of the increase in national wealth or revenue that the sovereign authority must have in view above all, but its equitability and stability; for happiness attaches itself to the duration of an invariant proportion between population and revenue; while, when one or the other are subjected to random odds, the unexpected opulence of a few can never be considered as compensation for the ruin and miserable death of many others.

We must descend to more specific considerations to make people better understand the need for protecting the poor and working classes, as well as how

sovereign authority can exercise it. The most numerous of these classes is the one devoted to agricultural work; on the other hand, this is also the one with which the authors of the chrematistic school concerned themselves the least. Today, however, it is perhaps more expedient than ever to get a sense of what the reaction to their principles should comprise.

We will aim in the following essays to explain society's current condition, and what is essential to be doing for its well being.

Instead of generalizing our observations, we will not hesitate to fix our gaze on a single country after another, and on the various consequences of various operating contracts for its land. We will look for the facts through analyzing special books, that often were intended to prove something entirely different than what we propose to extract from them for these essays, and we will in no way forget that on a subject which seems to be constantly under our scrutiny and about which so little is known, perhaps the most essential part however is to expose what is, rather than to show what must be.

FIRST SECTION

TERRITORIAL WEALTH

THIRD ESSAY

What is the Distribution of Territorial Wealth
which Provides the Most Happiness to Society

We have so far considered the efforts of man to create his subsistence through applied work, and the effects of this work on the whole of society. We have recognized that all we call wealth came from work alone; because it is work that creates, modifies, or at least gathers all the objects of nature that man applies to meet arising needs. But we also glimpsed that work, when it received a wrong impetus, could itself be the source of the misery it was made to dispel. And we understood that instead of pushing men to engage in it with ever increasing ardor, it could be expedient, for the good rule of the house and the community, for a sound political economy, to set limits to this production activity, so as to preserve the nation from a congestion of the products from its own industry that would be overwhelming it; and, to give to workers themselves guarantees against the effects of competition that they are willing to have with each other.

Acknowledging accurately what is necessary to do, and in order to save especially the most precious classes, the most valuable in the community, those that nourish us all, from the calamities which seem to threaten them, we have

furthermore noticed that it was these very classes that we should study, instead of fixing our eyes on the abstract nature of things, to be asking from observation the question – what in their social life makes them happy or causes their misfortune; follow them from country to country, in their customs, their habits, their domestic economies, and not think of any new systems until after having made sure of the facts.

It is with this study of man and human conditions, that we believe we have to start our profession; which at the same is the most encompassing and important one of all: acknowledging what brings forth the fruits of the earth. It is the one without which no society can exist, the one that seems the easiest route to happiness, since it's only for that knowledge that the dreams of the imagination can create a golden age; it is also that question however exposing who suffered most from human greed, who, because of a fundamental misinterpretation must have experienced all the calamities of the most extortive cruelty, misery and slavery.

Considering, in fact, any society in relation to the applied work to which it owes its subsistence, we see it divide into two main categories: one that asks the earth for output due to man's labor, the other asks them of men themselves; the first, solely occupied with fertilizing the soil entrusted to him, advances its work sowed into it, and men expect harvests from it in return that are higher in value and in quantity than the riches of its inputs. No doubt this is some kind of an exchange, but it's an exchange that man makes with nature. The farmer entrusts his capital to it, and receives back from it a revenue. He lives off territorial wealth; besides of which, he he can be independent, and somehow does not need other men. We can well imagine, we can even observe in quite a few countries, societies made up entirely of ploughmen and herdsmen, who devote themselves only to their work in the fields, while their wives prepare their clothes in their homes, so that they live without trades, without commerce, even without any other struggle than with nature.

The men of the second category, who live on commercial wealth, are only found in civilized societies, and are never alone there.

109

Intending to manage and exchange their work, their services, or the fruits of their labor with other men, they were called into existence originally for serving the farmers in a way; to relieve the latter of all the chores to which their work in the fields had rendered them somewhat ill fitted, as well as to prepare conveniences, the extra comforts of life, while agricultural output provides for its basic necessities.

Concerning the progress of civilization, the progress of wealth; these two classifications of men are to a certain extent confusing, whose character at first blush seems so different. While territorial wealth inheritors have been successively renouncing their independence, and ever more submit their industry to the hazards of commerce; those of commercial wealth, by having adapted for their own use the mutable forces of nature, acquire a resemblance to agricultural workers. Making a distinction between the two different kinds of industry, the one of the countryside and those of the towns however, is a necessary one for the purpose of science.

If the class of men who live on territorial wealth is the oldest and most essential one, the ones that live on commercial wealth owes its existence to civilization and progress. So the latter has always been regarded with a certain predilection by those who have sought in wealth the sources of national power. It is the importance and the multiplicity of exchanges, of which commerce is composed, which led to the instrument that facilitates and favors them the most, a currency. These exchanges relate to the capital of commercial wealth itself, while embracing only a part of the revenue from territorial wealth; which is smaller yet, the less society is advanced. Also, purely agricultural countries need to have infinitely less currency than commercially active countries. Trade has founded credit too, because all the merchant's capital passes through his hands, often several times a year, he can fulfill the commitments he made, should anyone take away

all his fortune. While the landowner has much more trouble to realize his revenue, and can not, without the assistance of commerce, discharge the debts which undermine his landed fortune. Specie and credit however, have long been considered as constituting wealth alone. The owners of those are the persons that governments covet, as they can employ them for instance for national defense funding. But they are also the ones who impressed governments with the illusion concerning the importance of commercial wealth, and who made them consider the latter specifically as constituting the wealth and resources of societies.

It may seem strange that this preference for commercial wealth of that type is still maintained today, since the nature of a currency and that of credit are so much better understood, and we no longer claim to enrich nations by attracting precious metals within the confines of their borders. Consider only the number of men to whom agriculture provides both work and subsistence, and this makes it well worth repeating what Sully said: that grazing and plowing were the two nurturing breasts of the state. But the mercantile system had been accustomed to looking at agriculture only in relation to the commercial activity it provides; and the chrematistic school, while pushing this system well into the background, still hasn't adopted broader views. J.-B. Say, in his 'Complete Course in Political Economy' (1), precisely defined the point of view from which the new school considers agriculture. "It is," he said, "a manufacture of rural products, which should be assimilated by any other manufacture; it's a barter of all its own production costs carried out against all the products it obtains, a barter all the more advantageous as one gives less to obtain more ... Also, according to him, "agriculture is in a state of progress whenever it manages to get more utility for the same costs, or the same utility for less."

This is the underlying principle, not only of Mr. Say, but

(1) Vol. I, p. 24.

of the entire chrematistic school, a principle vigorously pursued by all those who nowadays pretend to have the best interests of agriculture at heart: a principle with repercussions however, the consequences of which we will often have to deplore and combat.

According to these philosopher economists, the prosperity of agriculture must be valued by the net proceeds it provides to its entrepreneurs. The latter one earns, either by producing more or by spending less. He wins over the consumer, by selling him a larger quantity of his products, or by selling them to him at a higher price. He gains on his capitalist cooperators and on his workers, either by finding a way to have the same quantity of products and services supplied cheaper, or by having their work done without them, or for a lower wage. Thus we are told that the national

benefit of agriculture is a private profit, being made as a result of two public calamities – the dearness of subsistence and the misery of the worker.

In our opinion, political economy must consider territorial wealth in a much broader way. It must see this wealth as the greatest national asset, because the whole nation derives all its subsistence from it. In any well-regulated nation, by far the largest part of its population devotes both its work, and receives its reward from the earth. From this double perspective arises the question that we believe begs to be answered: what is the best distribution of territorial wealth that brings the most happiness to society? An apprehensiveness arises first. The soil that is subject to the work of man is not itself a production of this work but is a free gift of nature, like: air, water, fire, light; it is a gift that seems to have been given to the entire human species – why is it that a part of humanity is in fact deprived from this benefit? Why would an exclusive privilege be granted to another part of the species? Will this privilege not become ever more expensive as the quantity of land available to a nation is irrevocably fixed, and can't ever expand, its holders will have all the strength of a monopoly?

The commons of the earth is not a vain speculation. It has been put into

practice before by hunting peoples, by pastoral peoples, and even by some peoples who began to seek resources in agricultural works. It is also their experience that should answer our misgivings and shed more light on our theory. The hunting peoples, wandering in endless forests or savannas, looked at the land as equally given to all; they could not conceive of any barriers between each of their share; because they are forced to be on the move without any delays, to follow game which is escaping before them, and from which kill they await their sustenance. But they also cannot prepare anything for the future, they cannot accumulate, they have no revenue; hunting instead gives them random and uncertain profits, profits from the terrible game they play against wild animals and therefore also against themselves. Every benefit they get indeed decreases their own resources; everything other industry creates, destroys theirs; their ease, today in that they have killed some game, cause their future ruin; also famine threatens them around the clock, and it will soon make their race disappear: the red man cannot resist civilization any more than their beasts of prey which depopulate the forests with him.

Pastoral peoples form more powerful societies and more durable. There are countries, such as Arabia and Tartary, which seem destined by nature never to know other inhabitants seeking their space. On the other hand, some other countries have seen their wandering peoples settle; when their population increased, their society agreed to ensure its future by starting to undertake agricultural work. The Arabs and the Tartars didn't give in; the earth belongs to all, they say, like the air and like the water. They do not suffer from enclosures, no privilege of first occupant, and therefore they leave no man be born the desire to add nothing to his natural fertility,

to devote a job to him from which he would not reap the benefits. But they recognize and they guarantee ownership of the shepherd over his flocks; thereby, they encourage him to multiply them; thousands of horned beasts obey his voice,

113

their milk and annual births form the revenue of the shepherd; their herds being more or less proportioned to the quantity of fodder which nature supplies without care. While at barely a hundredth part of this same fodder could have been devoured by the game pursued by hunting peoples.

Thus a first care given by the hunting and gathering man wasn't to the soil itself but to the animals that like himself live off the ground. And a first guarantee granted by the society he finds himself a part of, involves the property that is claimed over the offspring of the animals of nature. This guarantee has infinitely multiplied human resources and his means of subsistence.

Among the pastoral peoples, there were some in Germany, just as there are today on the borders of Persia, who want to turn their attention to some agriculture as well; which make it possible to enclose a field and to sow it. But which, more covetous of their equality than their ease, requires that after the harvest each person's land lot returns to the commons; that, if necessary, will be subjected later to a new division. Something similar is also to be seen among hunting peoples in America. The red man cultivates some corn and potatoes around his wigwam. But after the harvest he will perhaps go with his tribe, in the pursuit of game, hundreds of leagues away. Claiming property on the earth isn't part of his culture, and so he abandons it after the harvest; and he could not think of clearing, perennial planting, nor doing any permanent works that would increase the richness of the soil.

There is however something to it, to have granted a guarantee to the annual work in agriculture, and everyone in society is starting to find a profit therein. Already, man does derive far more food from the earth by domesticating animals than by hunting wild animals; and again yet, he gets much more from the cultivation of cereals than from a gathering of spontaneously appearing grasses. A novel guarantee had been granted by society so as to form a property; it was a new extension on the free gifts from nature, and society as a whole has profited. As soon as a few of its members obtain more subsistence, all are more at their ease, and the danger of famine has thereby passed for the whole nation.

114

This experience could not have left any doubt about the socially useful effects of land appropriation. The hunter, the herder, once having sown a field, had passed from a wandering life, with its deprivation and misery, to abundance and stability. He saw clearly that his works of enclosure and clearing would benefit him all the more if he would continue them over

time in the same place. From the day he sowed the first grain of wheat he desired the perpetuity of the property. What most often prevented this desire to prevail wasn't the jealousy of those who would not be taking part in the division, because there was enough land to give everyone his own share, but the predilection to plunder inherent in the barbarian races. Each small society had its neighbors who wanted to harvest there where they had not sown. Agriculture put society in a state of dependency by fixing it in the same place, and thereby reducing it to a defensive mode. Each small society also counted among its members violent men who did not submit to any rule, but lacked the wherewithal how to suppress. This brigandage of both external enemies and its own members delayed for a long time the fixation of wandering peoples; although each of them recognized that by adopting an agricultural life they would pass from poverty to abundance. Finally, the feeling of well-being ensured by living their lives fixed on the fields won out. Nations guaranteed to each of their citizens the ownership of the works by which they improved the grounds; and, as these works could never be detached from the soil, perpetual ownership of the land ensued. So man subdued nature and completely renewed her face; so we could recognize the difference between wealth that land can produce and natural gifts with its all too often accompanying poverty. But we could now also recognize that what drove an intelligent man toward a constancy in his actions, what made him direct all his efforts towards a goal useful to his species, was the sense of perpetuity. The most fertile lands are always those whom the waters have deposited along their course, but they are also those that threaten with their floods or become corrupted by swamps. With the guarantee

115

of perpetuity, man undertook long and painful works to drain swamps dry, to raise dikes against floods, and to distribute fertilizing water through irrigation channels over the same fields, that these same waters had earlier forced into sterility. Under the same guarantee, man, no longer content with annual produce from the earth, untangled the plants among the wild vegetation – perennials, shrubs, trees that could be useful to him; he perfected them through culture, sometimes even by changing essential characteristics, and he multiplied them. Among the fruits, in particular, we recognize that only centuries of extensive culture could have brought out the perfection that they have achieved today; while others have been imported from more distant regions.

Man at the same time opened up the earth to great depths, to renew its soil and fertilize it by mixing up its parts and for air entrainment; he fixed on hills the soil that escaped from him, and he covered the face of the entire countryside with abundant vegetation everywhere, and everywhere being useful to the human race. Among his many works, there are some that will not reap any fruit until after ten or twenty years; there are others that his last nephews will still enjoy several centuries from now. All these efforts have contributed to increase the productive forces of nature, to give to the human species infinitely more abundant revenue, a considerable portion of

which is consumed by those who do not share in the territorial property, and who however would not have found food without this sharing of the soil by those who seem to have disinherited them.

Thus the perpetual ownership of land has been invented; and with it, to be guaranteed for the benefit of all. This origin must in no way be lost sight of; because the property is only legitimate as long as it is administered in accordance with the purpose for which it was instituted. All territorial property was given over to private interest, so that it thereby would increase the production and social revenue. The owner of such property therefore commits an unjust and illegitimate act, if he starts to abuse the concession with the aim to restrict production, or aspiring to get

116

revenue not from what the land will give him, but from what he will take from other men. Territorial ownership has been guaranteed to him, so far as having a perpetual right to it, but is always administered with a view to the future. He therefore makes use of it unjustly and illegitimately, if he abandons that right to men who only have casual and temporal interests. And he thus deprives society of all the advantages of this perpetuity which has been guaranteed to him, only so and under the condition of him guaranteeing, in return, to a constantly progressing agricultural wealth. Our imagination could not conceive of a happier state than that of a population dedicated to the cultivation of lands, who are practicing it with their own hands, and who are imparting with that a political organization energetic enough and free enough so that the territorial fruits are always guaranteed to the one that created them. This was the natural fate of most of the nascent peoples, small tribes who gave up their wandering life to settle down and walk towards civilization instead. It was in making this important step that the Hellenes and the Italians replaced the Pelages, and that from then on their civil and military virtue, their population and their happiness, went on increasing for many generations. At this origin of societies each was absolute master of the land, which he cultivated with his hands, he paid no rent to any one. Everyone was working with equal rights and for equal benefits. The works were distributed throughout the year in such a way that each day had its sufferings, but that each day also had its recreations and pleasures. Food was raised from the land, but it was varied and plentiful. Clothes also found their origin in the soil, with hemp, wool, and animal skins, provided the material; but they were made by the women inside their dwellings. Rome had already risen to a high degree of power, glory and even wealth; but the city still had no factories, no shops, no other types of businesses at all. All what we call nowadays the industry of the cities was carried out in the interior of the houses of the landowners. However, a terrible institution already existed in this prosperous society,

117

it was domestic slavery; but was only existing there in its infancy, and one could not have foreseen then the bitter fruits it produced when opulence

would be increasing. Slavery in those days was still only a softening of the law of war. These wars which were waged between small tribes, same race, same language, same manners, left no deep resentments behind in their wake. The captive, called to work with his master, lived with him, ate at his table, was associated with his sons; because in Roman legislation the sons were under the power of their father to the same degree as slaves. Debtors, arrested for debts owed, were similarly assimilated as well. Slavery was still a rare exception, and their work had not yet been dishonored. This characteristic changed completely as soon as the great fortunes arose.

As long as ancient Europe was divided between small free peoples and cultivators, their prosperity grew with astonishing speed. The culture spread from the plains to the top of the mountains. All means to increase the fertility of the land were successively discovered, all products arising from the soil that could satisfy human tastes were in turn called into their existence. This rural region just outside of Rome, today deserted and cleansed from the breath of man, was covered with a population so tight that five acres were supposed to be more than enough to support a family. However, despite the frequent wars, this population was ever increasing. Just as a hive of bees every year produces a new swarm; each city, after the development of each generation, needed to send a colony outward. And this colony, re-starting the social progress according to the same principles, with its peasants as owners, and expecting everything from agriculture, marched rapidly towards the same prosperity. It was then that the human species spread all over the face of the earth, and that in a reciprocal independence, in the midst of abundance and virtues, grew the nations whose fate came later to be decided by politics and by war.

Rural happiness, whose history presents us the picture of the glorious times of Italy and Greece, isn't unknown to us in our century either. Everywhere we find peasant owners, we also find this ease; this security, this calming confidence in the future, this independence, which at the same time ensure happiness and virtue. The peasant who does all the work of his small plot inheritance with his children, who pays no rent to anyone above him, no wage to anyone below, who regulates its production based on his consumption, who eats his own wheat, drinks his own wine, puts on his hemp and woolens, cares little about market prices; for, having little to sell and little to buy, will not never be ruined by revolutions in commerce. Far from fearing for the future, he sees it to beautify one's being in one's hope; because it provides an advantage for his children for the centuries to come. Every moment, not requiring of him the ongoing seasonal work, is contemplated that way. It satisfied him that in a few moments of work, to put into the ground the nucleus, which in a hundred years hence will have become a magnificent tree, to dig the trench that will be draining his fields forever, to raise the aqueduct that will bring him a source of living water, to improve by often repeated care, but stolen in his lost moments, all kinds of animals and plants with which he surrounds himself. His small heritage

is a real savings fund, always ready to receive his small superfluities, that are all used up in leisure time. The ever-active power of nature is making them fruitful, and gives them back to him a hundredfold.

The peasant has a keen sense of the happiness attached to the condition of ownership. So he is always eager to buy land at any price. He pays more for it than it is worth, more even than it perhaps will give him back. But why should he be blamed for estimating at a high price the advantage of henceforth always working advantageously, without being obliged to offer the results at a discount? to always be able to bake one's own bread, without having to overpay for it at some market!

It is above all to Switzerland that one must travel, to study and judge the happiness of the peasant owners. It is

119

Switzerland that one has to get to know to be convinced that agriculture practiced by those who themselves reap the fruits is sufficient to provide a great ease to a very substantial population. Characterized by its salient independence, the natural result of its geographic location; yet a having a prominent consumer trade, a consequence of the well-being of all its inhabitants. And all this despite being a country with soil that is hardly fertile, a harsh climate, and where late frosts and the inconstancy of the growing season often destroy the hopes of the plowman. One can either walk through the riant Emmenthal, or sink into the most remote valleys of the canton of Bern, one cannot see without admiration, without affection, these wooden houses of the lowest peasant, so vast, so well enclosed, so well built, so covered with artistic sculpture. In their interiors, wide corridors open up each room of the large family; each room has only one bed, and it is abundantly furnished with curtains, blankets and the whitest of linens. Neat furniture surrounds it and the cabinets are filled with yet more linen. The dairy barn is large, airy, and exquisitely neat; under the single roof there are large supplies of wheat, salted meat, cheese and firewood. In the stables one sees the best cared-for cattle, that no doubt is the most beautiful of Europe. The garden is planted with flowers. Men and women alike are warmly and neatly dressed, the latter proudly preserving their ancient costume; all wear the imprint of vigor and health on their faces. The beauty of their features is striking; which becomes the character of a race, when for several generations it has suffered neither from vice nor from want. Let other nations praise their wealth; Switzerland can always counter them with pride in its peasants.

The peasant owner is of all cultivators the one who gets the most out of the soil, because he is the one who thinks about it most from a future perspective; just like whoever is most enlightened by experience; it is again he who makes the best use of human labor. Dividing its chores between all the members of his family, he spreads it out over all days of the year, so that there is no unemployment for anyone. Of all cultivators he is the happiest. At the same time, in a given space, the earth does not nourish well,

without exhausting itself; and never occupies so many inhabitants as when they are owners. Finally, of all cultivators the peasant owner is the one who gives the most encouragement to commerce and industry, because he is the richest.

Will we thus conclude that all owners should also be ploughmen? No, we take society as it is, with rich and poor; and we believe this variety causes advantageous conditions for its development. The wealthy class seems necessary to us, because there are faculties of the mind and soul that only develop intelligently under conditions of complete leisure. Because man's material activities dull the other faculties; because the constant attention to pecuniary interests narrows the heart; because the most exquisite progress of the human spirit must be pursued in a selfless manner and not for profit; because a nation composed of men who are all equal, even though well nourished, well housed, well dressed, and working only as long as their health would let them do it well, would seem to us to be deprived of the most beautiful gifts that Providence has given to man, if it were incapable of rising to the fine arts, the high sciences, and sublime philosophy.

Moreover, such a nation would be incapable of cultivating the social sciences sufficiently to know how to maintain its own happiness. We do not believe that men who must serve as a torch for humanity, are most often born within the wealthy class; but the latter alone appreciates them and has the leisure time available to enjoy their work. The rich can be seen as consumers rather than being producers of intellectual wealth. Without them there would be no more demand for the advancement of arts, letters, and science beyond an immediate utility. Everything there is in the human development of the transcendent would be abandoned.

Congregating the rich in urban centers isn't the end of it all either, at least some of them must live

in rural regions. Most often they themselves feel that desire too. Those, among the rich, for whom worldly pleasures aren't seducing, will want to keep at least taking part in the pleasures of the nature that we claim for the domain of the poor. Besides, land ownership develops qualities in the rich that are important for a nation to preserve. The owners who are living in the countryside are more intimately connected with the people. They know them better, and they are linked with interest and affection to the province and district they inhabit. They have a more vivid recollection of the olden days, and more real zeal for their posterity. Their property, which is passed down from generation to generation, gives them a sense of perpetuity that makes them conservationists, in the midst of the daily innovations of other orders. They do not like to subject themselves to the hazards of chance, which excite some rich for a day of mad expenses and for temporal pleasures. They are less exposed than others to the rivalries of gain, resentment and hatred, because their calamities are acts of God and don't stem from human intrigue.

Finally their presence in the countryside tends to civilize it, in spreading there their sweetness of manners, their tastes, their elegance; which to some extent can also become popular in those regions. To introduce there not the high culture of the sciences, but their practical applications; and in particular to allow agriculture to benefit from all those discoveries in the speculative studies.

It suffices to abandon the interests of men to their free development, so that, in every society where liberty and property are protected, one sees families rising to ease and sometimes to wealth. The legislator does not need to make anyone rich nor powerful; but legislation providing both protection and intervention, are necessary to maintain a balance between the rich and the poor, that will be recognized as the most advantageous to society. So we need rich people, no doubt, but that doesn't mean we must pass all property to the rich. The law needs to guarantee the poor their share in the territorial wealth. We still need rich everywhere, and in such proportion, that their beneficial influence extends over

122

all parts of the country. It is therefore necessary to have legislation that ensures property does not become too concentrated in a small number of hands. For each time that two heritages combine within the same family, society, in having had two wealthy families, now loses one; and as a consequence loses half of the benefits it was hoped for, in the presence of the rich in the countryside.

We have not yet come to the means of such legislation, to the changes which might be desirable to make in the laws. We are only looking for guiding principles as to what is in the best interest of society, insofar the influence that wealth exerts on the happiness of all. We strive to recognize what a prosperous nation must desire before daring to tell it what to do. These guiding principles, at least as they appear to us, are still far removed from current practices. It looks like the exponents of legislation don't believe themselves called upon to inquire about the distribution of wealth that is most suitable for the progress and happiness of all.

Some, always figuring that private interest is the best guide towards the general interest, ask that all transactions which regulate the distribution of property be abandoned to the natural struggle between the poor and the rich; this is what they call a system of freedom. The others, imbued with the idea that democracy threatens on all sides of power and property, think only of in terms of protecting and/or accumulating wealth. They invented for this the primogenitures, the substitutions, all the concordant inequality in the division of inheritances, all the favors granted to ancient property which seem to them to be suitable for guaranteeing the rich the perpetuity of their wealth, and this is what they call a conservative system.

However, men have not at all times lost view of this social happiness from which we would like to derive guiding principles for the legislation of territorial property. They sensed again and again that the nation in essence was made up from the great mass of cultivators; that the happiness and the

strength of the country was therefore to be sought in the happiness and the security of its peasants, and they then proposed

123

guarantees against themselves so that they would no longer be tempted to transfer all property to the rich. It was necessary for this to ensure that the number of peasant owners remained almost the same, as the lands which formed their little inheritances were never going to increase the legacies of the lords. We succeed in France by giving to the lands themselves the character of a nobility to the commoners. M. de Montlosier claims that this distinction dates from the Gallic republics. "The lands," he said, "had conditions; and of the ranks, the 'alleux' were for the rich, while the 'ut tributaries' were for the poor" (1). The classification seems rather to carry the character of the Middle Ages, during which time it was always in force. The lords could not buy the lands of the villains, because they would carry with them a sort of degradation.

Likewise in England, the aristocracy had the 'freeholds', and it left the 'copyholds' to the peasants. But nowadays the tenure in a copyhold no longer affects the condition of owners; as also all 'copyholds' have been bought by the rich, and there is no longer any peasant who cultivates his own piece of land. In Austria, where the government distrusts intellectual development, but where it often protects with material happiness, the law guarantees the cultivator that his share in the ownership of the land will not be diminished. The nobleman who buys a property from a peasant must resell it to another peasant and cannot change the condition.

We will find with more difficulty examples of legislation which provides for the equal distribution of wealth in all the land of the state; which hinders the fusing of several heritages in one. Because, although this concentration of wealth, by reducing the number of the rich, weakens their class, it is advantageous to individuals; and it is they who in general also wielded power and made the laws.

So hardly anyone thought of anything but the means of preserving that what they once held, and continually tried increasing it. However at the time when one saw in the territorial property rather

(1) Monarchie française Vol. I, p. 9.

124

more military power than wealth, the great lords did not allow any manor that came under them to be abandoned. Despite the reunification by inheritance of several manors into one family, they demanded that for each 'Knight's fee' attached to a manor, a knight fit to join him at his service, was presented. The society that guaranteed the fortunes of the rich, as useful to all citizens, who wanted them to be dispersed throughout its territory to spread the lights or benefits, is even more interested than the overlord lord once was that no manor is abandoned. So that this tiny center

of civilization, this home of charity, this small trading market in the countryside, is not closed to the poor.

It is on the poor rural dweller, in fact, on the poor farmer, whom the eye of the legislator must usually be fixed. Other conditions will generally work out well to take care of themselves, but in a struggle between all interests, the class that is closest to need alleviation is also always the closest to being oppressed. Universal competition calls on everyone to strive outwearing their opponent in order to secure a better deal with him. But he who has the least provisions made for the future is the sooner weary; the poor cannot afford to wait, and in the struggle for territorial property the poor have indeed been cruelly stripped.

We saw how the poor farmer can be made happy by his participation in property; how much, in fact, he was happy among all the humble peoples of antiquity, contemporaries of the first Romans. How the ownership of property there gave the countryside a large and belligerent population which, through the products of a rich agriculture, spread its abundance everywhere. We've seen how happy he is today in Switzerland; how much he still approaches this same happiness in countries less free or less well governed. But when despotism overwhelms a nation, the peasants are its first victims. Commercial wealth is mobile, and merchants are successful, for a time, shielding it from the eyes of their oppressors; but agricultural wealth is always exposed to all prying eyes. He who creates it cannot move away from it; he is chained to it by his livelihood, and finds himself under the whip of the tyrant who wants to strip him.

125

Tyranny over the cultivator is usually exercised by a single master, under oriental despotism; but in the West it is by several masters, and it is the latter which can become the most cruel. For there to be some order in society, and the properties of the rich be guaranteed, it must be calculable just how little the share of subsistence is necessary to put the poor in a state so they can work. During times of Roman greatness, slaves were solely responsible for all the work of agriculture, and their suffering, their oppression, were as appalling as nowadays those of the negroes in the colonies. But when the advance of despotism had deprived property of all guarantees, when all the borders were opened to the barbarians; we saw the lives of this servile population, all by themselves responsible for the work in the fields, diminish with inconceivable rapidity. Some Roman slaves were kidnapped by the barbarian conquerors and put on the market; others went of their own accord to seek refuge in made-up camps; others again, forced to do in addition to their work all that of the fugitives, perished from fatigue and misery. Never had the human race seemed so close to extinction; slavery could hardly have been maintained for a longer time. In Asian monarchies, it does not seem that the culture took to slavery *per se*. The peasant, the fellah, is made to believe, in fact, that he is the master of his fields, by paying the annual fee, the 'miri', that he owes to the government. But this government which burdens him with extraordinary extractions is not in any position to protect him against his own hirelings,

nor from all the roving bandits, who come in from the desert to strip him. So the fellah, forever hoping, and some appearance of property attaching him to his land, submits and pays up; as his only other choice is fleeing into the deserts and perish within a few weeks.

126

In English India, the Asian system submitted to rules a little more precise. It has been consolidated there somewhat, and this is worth acknowledging to appreciate the fate of twenty-four million cultivators who live under the domination of East India Company. This Company, having taken over the rights of the local sovereigns, is considered to be the sole owner of the land. All the peasant farmers, known by the name of 'ryots', derive their harvests from their land; and pay in kind a fixed royalty. The collectors receiving this royalty from the hands of the ryots, are called 'zémindars'; these had been the sovereign's employees since time immemorial. The zémindar retains for himself a tenth of the revenue, and pays the rest to the sovereign. Under the Muslim rulers, the zémindars were at the same time police magistrates and peace officers in their own district; but today their functions reduced to that of tax collectors only. But the ryot or hereditary sharecropper is at least protected against their abuses. There is in each province a maximum quantity named the 'nerick', above which the royalty of each ryot cannot rise. The little inheritance of his land cannot be taken away from him as long as he pays his royalty, which he transmits in perpetuity to his descendants. The extent of these inheritances varies from six to twenty-four English acres (1).

The security with which English courts bestow today on the inhabitants of submissive India, the ryot's condition is not an unhappy one; and there are several countries in Europe where the peasants might envy him. He looks at himself like the owner of a property that is guaranteed to him forever, and that he in no way can lose; because even after the devastations of war and tyranny, the descendants of the fugitive ryot, who might have spent several generations in exile, can demand and indeed often obtain the inheritance of their ancestor. The royalty of the ryot is not excessive, he is independent in his work, and he is assured of reaping the benefits. There is no lack of peasants in English India and the legacies of the rich are visibly intertwined with theirs. India does not bear men of leisure.

(1) The English acre equals 40,860 square feet in France.

127

The wealthy are men of intelligence, proud men, free men that mix with the farmers; and the latter, like a flock without shepherds and dogs, would not know how to defend themselves, when some powerful outside force oppresses them.

Returning from Asia to Europe we encounter the Slavic population which covers a large part of our continent, and which from ancient times seems to have practiced agriculture. But on the other hand, as far as we can go

back in its history, we see a submissive class of cultivators, to that of the warrior class, and reduced to a state of serfdom. Perhaps the vicinity of pastoral peoples and the ease with which these could invade the immense Slavonic plains contributed to putting these two castes in opposition. The plowman, attached to the ground by the nature his work, would have been easily subjugated by the herder; always on horseback and always quick to go to war. The conditions of serfdom no doubt were onerous, but not entirely oppressive. The ruler, the warrior, saw himself as owner of the land, but he shared it with the plowman. He granted the latter a dwelling and fields which form his hereditary heritage, and he asked him in return to devote half of each week to cultivate the fields which were the warrior's reserve.

Each seignury is made up of two parts: the land of the feudal lord, which is cultivated by means of these chores, and the part that he shared among a large number of peasant families; that each family cultivates during the three days of the weeks which remain free. In Russia, the drudgery of the peasants chores has generally been replaced by a monetary royalty, called 'the obroc' which by its nature is always supposed to be equal, but that in a country without freedom and without guarantee, the lord can aggravate according to his whim.

The western regions of Europe, which once formed the Roman Empire, were invaded by Germanic conquerors, independent, proud of their bravery, covetous of freedom and ready to despise the enslaved peoples they had won over. The yoke of the conquerors was hard and oppressive, but it was not uniform. The lands of the empire were

128

cultivated by slaves; often the winner reduced his opponent to slavery, and made him work alongside his existing slaves. Wars and oppression were all consuming, quickly ridding the race off free men, and under the empire of Charlemagne, in the midst of his apparent glory, the malignancy of slavery had destroyed the population so rapidly that the largest provinces of Gaul were unable to defend themselves against two or three hundred Normans, when these adventurers set out to ravage them. But before the end of the Carolingian reign the imperial scepter shattered, and a true sovereignty passed to the lords of the castles with the right of war and peace. And these, in need to find vigor in their peasants to make them soldiers, lightened the yoke earlier imposed, and gave them their lands; which had become almost deserted by now, so that these could again be cultivated but now under more favorable conditions. It was then that the various orders of peasants originated, that we see still existing today. The vast majority of families had died among the nobility as among the peasants, so that the patrimonial heritages of the first were of an immense extent. It had taken possession of entire provinces, but deserted provinces; and whatever the aristocratic greed, it would not have been able to obtain considerable royalties from its peasants. Generally, greed was inspired by another feeling – sometimes love of power, sometimes pride, sometimes caprice.

It divided the lands of the seignury between villains, abandoning them in perpetuity, but yet imposing on them rather than royalties a variety of services. Some were asked for military duty, others chores, from everyone obedience, and often this was added to the most humiliating customs. Each manor had its own, but all of these feudal customs held the whole class of cultivators in the fear of humiliation, even more than in poverty. The farmer could fear of at any time being kidnapped off his livestock and his crops; but the earth at least was his The earth

129

held in villeinage, chargeable with royalties and perpetual services, was also to be passed on to his descendants in perpetuity. Even before the Revolution the most odious of the imposed services on villains were successively abolished; and from this origin, today come these many peasant owners which are the strength and wealth of France. Other lords, however, considering securing a revenue rather than power, distributed the lands of their lordships under two different conditions. To some they allocated a portion of land with the necessary capital to develop it; on the condition that the peasant would be responsible for all the cultural work and that he would share the crops with his lord: these were the sharecroppers; to others, who already had amassed a small capital, they gave the bare land, on the condition that the peasant would cultivate it with complete independence, but that for a fixed number of years he would pay in money an always equal rent: these were the farmers. Both of these systems indicated a progress of civilization and security. The peasant no longer alienated his condition as a free man, nor did his dignity suffer. He stipulated, almost on an equal footing, a simple pecuniary interest. All in all he was making a good deal for himself, and better still for the owner; because the latter one from then on obtained an assured revenue, which did not cease to increase with the improvements in agriculture; but while its market was temporal, all other conditions were perpetual. The situation of the sharecropper, true enough, is always the same too; the ownership is usually kept by the same family, from one generation to the next. On the other hand, he could be tempted to take advantage of the same improvements as the farmer had made and to ask him, at the end of his lease, for a considerable rent increase, or to return it. There used to be many ways to achieve a distinction or power, today all seem to boil down to only one – the acquisition of wealth. Also, this goal is more openly offered for everyone's efforts, more systematically for any follow-ups; as no one is content with their fortune anymore, if a way is offered to earn more. This emulation,

130

or greed, that is sensed in all states, found its reaction also in agriculture. For a large part the emerged scandal there can be attributed to the modern reestablishment of slavery in the colonies, by the most commercially inclined peoples and its recent incarnation in the Free States of America.

After our forefathers had universally been proscribing this criminal violence against our brothers, as equals, after they had done honor to this abolition by the spread of Christianity, to the progress of enlightenment, to the growing respect for liberty and human rights; our contemporaries re-established slavery with an aggravation of horrors that had not been known in Europe since fall of Rome. And these are the most enlightened, the most free, the same ones who profess the deepest attachment to religion, who continue to imprint this indelible stain on humanity. But closer to home, and in a less scandalous way no doubt, the growing greed for gain has upset once again the condition of the cultivators; which slowly had been improving throughout the Middle Ages, or so they thought, and gives them the opportunity to regret, in the midst of a so-called ever increasing prosperity, the times that have been called barbarian. It is this condition of the farmers which opened a whole new field to the activity of speculation, as well as to the teachings of the chrematistic school. These new economists on the one hand, and the apparently more skillful agronomists on the other, never stop celebrating rich and intelligent farmers who run large farms. They admire the extent of their buildings, the perfection of their agricultural implements, the beauty of their cattle.

But in the midst of this admiration for things, they not only forget men, they even forget to count them. The English mile contains 640 square acres: this is about the measure of a beautiful and rich new English farm. Old farms, those that a good family of plowmen could cultivate with their own hands, without help from outside, without day laborers, but also without unemployment, and each member of the family having guaranteed work for each day of the year, would be about a sixty-four acre farm. It would have taken ten of those to make up a modern farm. Ten peasant families were therefore

131

let go to make way for the farmer of the new system, who by no means is a peasant. He doesn't contribute to its production other than by the use of his capital and his intelligence. He does not work with his hands, but he regulates the crops, he supervises and presses his workers, he buys, he sells, he keeps accounts, and finally occupies the same place in agriculture that the merchant or the factory manager occupies in the industrial arts. Indeed, he is designated in the countryside of Rome by the name of 'mercanti di tenuta', in England by that of the 'gentleman farmer'; but, as much as we esteem the condition of the rich farmer, so much do we lower that of the men who do the work in the fields for him. The first was an earmark for the exercise of will, choice, and intelligence; it is therefore fair to say that he resists those attributes in his workers and his servants. He only asks them to use their muscular strength, and he denigrates them as much as he can to the rank of machines. Society must be careful not to put in conflict the interest of those who have intelligence and wealth, and of those who only have the strength of their arms. The first, as means to increase profits, may be tempted to push the latter into an increasingly

precarious condition. Often, when either one or the other seeks justness through force, a terrible bloody revolution follows, or even upsetting all of society. If on the contrary the struggle continues silently, if opposing interests surface in apparently free markets, it is always the rich man who lays down the law on the poor. The farmer rules the day laborer, and often in turn the owner rules the farmer. Because the extent of the terrain being limited, the one who possesses it acts against those who want to work it with all the monopoly power in their possession.

As was noted before, the chrematistic school has only considered in agriculture the interests of men who act with the power of this monopoly. They call “profit” any savings that can be made on their production costs, that is to say, about the maintenance of the men they employ. In our eyes these men are the nation; because cultivators form not only by far the greatest number, but also

132

produce the most essential part of subsistence, as they are for the defense of the country. The production costs that we want to save on them, is their happiness. It is the superfluities of the poor that represents all the material pleasures for them; like: good food, good accommodation, good clothing, good health that are all attached to his physical ease. The rest and leisure aspects, which are necessary for some cheerfulness and pleasure coming into his life; so that for a little while at least he can loose himself in the culture of affections, and give a little time to the culture of intelligence. But it is not only the happiness of men that is striven to be eliminated as an unnecessary production cost, it is the man himself. The main advantage that is apparent as attached to large farms, with rich capital, sophisticated machinery and a higher intelligence, is the acquired faculty of doing the same amount of work with an ever smaller number of cultivators. While, indeed, in all the rest of the world it is estimated that agriculture employs three quarters to four-fifths of each nation, England achieved to return three-quarters of the nation from the fields to towns. To an economist of men and not of wealth such progress will not be seen without deep pain. No manual labor maintains as much health, bodily vigor, and cheerfulness, than that of agriculture; non prepare better soldiers for the defense of the homeland; none, by its variety, develops intelligence so much; none, if the plowman is associated with the property, promises to those who make a living with their own hands as much security for the future; none excites so little jealousy between people with alike occupation, offers so little seduction for vice and does not retain so much morality. When once all the soil of a country is cultivated, each saving of labor that is made on rural work is sending back from the fields to the city as many families that will be condemned to misfortune. At the same time they succeed in getting themselves hired in some factory, they must give up – clean air, sunlight, exercise, the spectacle of nature, the joy of the fields, a variety in their occupations, and a guarantee of their future. Their situation becomes precarious and dependent; their customs corrupt,

because debauchery is the only way open to them to dull the present, and they are not long in perishing. Without doubt it is not appropriate, in the countryside no more than in cities, that the population exceeds certain limits, that it be reduced to competing with itself, to be offering its work at a discount, or to devote a larger share to produce less, so that it ceases to be amply paid. But in any country where the farmer has some guarantee of his existence, some present happiness and indeed some future, its very prosperity poses a barrier to the disproportionate increase in population. It is even the only one that is effective. No one voluntarily descends from his condition in life, and it is rare in any country for a son of a family to marry, before being assured of being able to live pretty much as his father. In countries with little culture, in fact, no peasant, whether he is an owner, farmer or sharecropper, marries if he cannot drive his wife or to his father whom he is to succeed, or to another man in the same position who has an assured job for him. But the son and all the sons of the day laborer get married as soon as they have acquired their spade; which they know was the sole property of their father when he got married, and as soon as they have the work he had. Now society must want the population to be as large as it can be while living honorably, morally, happily, but not to ever exceed this limit.

The revolution that economists and agronomists propose to accomplish in agriculture by the introduction of large farms, and a completely scientific system of cultivation, in yet another way threatens national happiness. It makes growers lose sight of the relationship that is so essential to maintain between the demands of consumption and production; it delivers for trading on the market almost the entire crop of each large farmer; making everyone

dependent on everybody. It hands every existence over to the vagaries of the market, all according to the prices established there, and this in turn condemns anyone to be either stifled by abundance, or to languish in misery. Until quite recently, agricultural wealth was withdrawn from this great game of chance the market represents; the farmer accomplished with the help of the earth, as being the one and only exchange on which his subsistence depended. Such was, such still is the economy of the peasant owner in any country where the agricultural class is really prosperous. It counts for all that he needs to live from with his family – wheat, wine, and food of all kinds; these being the first products he secures, and having to pay neither an annuity to an owner nor wages to workers. He only needs money for some almost luxury goods in the cities; which he intends to buy after selling some foodstuffs that he brings to these cities. He will choose the things he is most assured of selling, and of such a specific nature that it is unlikely to encumber the market. The peasant who bought his land on credit and who has burdened it with debts, or who has burdened it with a perpetual royalty in money, is much less free in his industry. Collecting

enough to live on is not enough for him; he must sell, and sell at all costs, to get the money he needs. He has to sell in the city anyway, and if he can't do it with profit because city dwellers don't care to buy his produce at that price, he must sell it to them at a loss. At least his own consumption which includes all the production costs of his harvest is subtracted from this market chance. Yes his royalty is stipulated in commodities only, so he escapes this annoying necessity; he is not, like the farmer or the debtor of an annuity, called upon to sell ever more wheat as the wheat price drops, or, what amounts the same thing, that consumers need less of it. In other systems of agricultural production, the plowman who, under different conditions produces the yields of the earth, won't be taking them to the market. He knows the amount of wheat, wine, oil, hemp, which he needs for himself; he works, he harvests, he does not evaluate

135

his days nor the value of his food in terms of money. As long as he can live in abundance, he is content. He fears no calamity other than that of the seasonal weather, and the thought of being ruined by the wealth of natural gifts to him never even enters his mind. He does not keep everything for himself, however; the sharecropper gives the owner his Sunday share, the Indian ryot brings the harvest share to the zémindar and belonging to the sovereign, the Slavic lord packs in his granaries the wheat that his serfs produced by their chores on the fields of the lordship. This is the same part which must nowadays feed the cities, is the part that is subject to trade and brought to market; but it all belongs to the rich. The rich alone play the odds of rising and falling market prices; they run these on the basis of what for them is a net profit. Their revenue may increase or decrease according to these chances; but their capital isn't committed agriculturally, it is therefore never entangled.

In the agriculture of the large farms that is represented to us as perfect, all the farms' produce is subject to market chances. The consumption of the farmer's family is so little, compared to the crops on which they speculate, that this doesn't even enter the picture. He pays in money, on the one hand his rent, and on the other, all his day laborers; so he must make money on his wheat, before making any profit. The smartest, and most enterprising English farmer of all, will hardly ever inquire about how much wheat his region is in need of. The sea, the canals, the railways give it the means of transporting so easy that he regards the whole of England as forming his market. He never assumes that by producing in excess of demand, he can cause a bottleneck in such a vast market. However, when the all the grains of America, the Baltic or the Black Sea regions, arrive in competition with him, he feels aggrieved, he complains, he asks for prohibitions, he shows that the loss on his industry does not only take his revenue, but that it breaches his capital. He obtains, in fact, what are called protective rights, which are not always sufficient to protect it; because he can't sure that it is not himself who has caused the crowding of the markets which has been ruining it for him.

Regardless these rights will protect only him, because the true cultivators, his day laborers, have an interest that is the very opposite of his. Having only their wages to live on, they want their bread to be cheap.

Soon he will experience a resentment against the farmer under whom he works and with whom he must live, that will end up endangering society itself. In fact, in everything that relates to him in his daily life he meets an enemy, a man who tries to reduce his wage, to make his work useless and make it more expensive for him to subsist.

The question of free trade in wheat, which for so many years aroused so much in the way of passions, and which seems insoluble like all those of modern political economy; has never reminded anyone that political economy itself as a science was born for the purpose of advancing society, to understand that what we call our progress? Before the invention of large farms, before these farming improvements which made so much human labor useless, and therefore took the bread out of so many mouths, we had never thought about laws demanding an increase in the price of wheat. All government research, to the contrary, was directed toward making bread available to its people at a lower price. Moreover, the chrematistic school rarely pursues the abstract goal of its proposals, without deviating from it by the very route by which it claims to approach it. Like us, it considers work the great creator of social wealth; but while it watches with rigorous attention over the poor never voluntarily wasting their days in idleness and joy, it does not hesitate to condemn them frequently for not working even though no work is available, to remain with folded arms, but with empty stomachs and with hearts consumed with worries. It offers the rich and intelligent farmer a double profit, for doing it all at once and in the most suitable season offering the most important jobs; with hundreds of workers that he will then dismiss, because of operating by machines to do all what needs to be done, human intelligence and skill are no longer necessary.

But the peasant owner, the peasant who works for himself; instead of him separating his own interest from the interest of those of his helpers, knows that there are dead seasons in the year. There are days of rain and snow where nothing can be done in the fields, and he reserves these times for works that are not so urgent. He arranges for his whole family of helpers to work all year round too, so that it also is always busy. He does not disdain even those whose work doesn't pay their wages, that is to say those things which could be accomplished by more economical means; as long as it is more economical than not doing it at all and sit around doing nothing. A machine for threshing wheat, which would leave him without work with his helpers, during the bad winter days, would only cause him harm. The rich farmer sends his workers away after the harvest is done regardless of what happens to them during the off season. But society, if it keeps its accounts well, will say that he is stealing from the public charity. It will conclude that to make a true account of the profit which is deriving

from any mechanical invention; the loss that this causes to all the workers whom this invention deprives of work, until they have found a job just as advantageous as the one they had previously, must always be deducted. The very ones who only want to calculate the progress of wealth, and so fully discount the developments of popular intelligence if these are not realized in money, are nevertheless obliged to admit its importance when gets the job done faster and better. In manufacturing, this work is most often identical all year around. Also, one finds profit there in consigning each worker to a separate manual operation that is always the same; which he does all the more quickly as it is more used to it, and for which he does not need intelligence and almost no goodwill. It is held there to be most advantageous also, when a machine can replace a man; and that a man is nothing more than a machine anyway. But agriculture does not admit this sacrifice of the noblest faculties of a human being to cupidity. His work inconsistently

138

urgent, inconsistently important, vary each day, and require, alongside a finely tuned physical strength, a diligent application of intelligence, and a sustained concern at being successful in what one does. The farmer who renounces the intelligence and the interest of his worker makes a miscalculation; because this intelligence and this desire to succeed must direct every stroke of the pruner and nearly every shovel load. So that the land is cultivated intelligently, with love, the work must similarly be done by the same one who advances it and who benefits from it. No gentleman farmer, other things being equal, can in this respect be compared to the peasant owner, who adds most directly to this interest all the memories of experience, and all the hopes for a long future. The usufructuary of an emphyteutic lease, or the owner in charge of a land rent, has almost the same benefits, since it is assured in perpetuity. The sharecropper comes next; although he doesn't own the whole yield, he has as much interest as its owner in its abundance, and to the success of all his labors. The small farmer, the one who works the land with his own hands, has the same interest as the owner in the early years of his lease, but his interest changes in the latter; it is then that he sacrifices the future for the present, and that, to use the proverbial expression, 'he prunes the already ruined vines'. The serf does as badly as he can get away with in his chore on the land of the lord, but he works with love and intelligence on his own plot of land. The farm hand hired year round doesn't have any real interest in his work, but out of sympathy for his masters he will still seeks success. The day laborer hired by the week has no interest other than that of not getting too tired and not being fired, he brings neither intelligence nor love to his work. And finally, a slave has only an interest in deep-seated hatred and vengeance; he rejoices when the works which have made him suffer so much doesn't yield anything to his master. So the more the operation of an agricultural system elevates the condition of the farmer; the more it accords him ease and independence, the more also it unites in him an apt intelligence and love for his work which will ensure its success.

But considerations higher than those of profit and loss seem to us to have to direct the legislator's involvement. He must seek to preserve for the cultivators, of the wealth they give rise to, the commensurate part that is reconcilable with the continuation of their work, and spreading the most happiness possible on the largest class of citizens. He must provide security in the fields and to occupy with agricultural work as many citizens as possible; because, with equal revenue, the poor will enjoy better health and more happiness there than in the cities. He must set the conditions for developing their intelligence to as much as hard personal work will allow; and last but not least he must cultivate and strengthen their morality. With this goal in mind he must give stability to the existence of the cultivator, favor all contracts which give him a permanent right to the land; while to the contrary reject those which make his condition precarious. and which leave him in doubt about his future. Because morality is intimately linked to memories and hopes, it feeds on duration; it is zero for those who only consider the present moment. By the same token, the legislator will have to avoid procreating the occasions of struggle and rivalry, either between the farmers themselves, or between them and the other classes of the nation. And he will look for a system of farming that is most favorable to the harmony and happiness for all; not the one that will provide the owner with the most revenue, but the one that will closest unite the interests of the landowner with those of the actual cultivators.

In order to understand better how the legislator can accomplish this task, how he can take care not of the increase of wealth as considered in the abstract, but that of the happiness and the morality of our most numerous class of citizens. We believe that our eyes must be focused on some of the countries in turn, where the fate of its cultivators can teach us what to look for, and what should be avoided.

FOURTH ESSAY

Condition of the Gaelic Cultivators in Scotland and their Expulsion.

We have been seeking to understand two doctrines in opposition to one another: one that we call chrematistics, with its focus on wealth increase; the other, political economy or rule of the house and the community. The proposed aim of the first is to produce everything as cheaply as possible; the second, to distribute the work and its products in such a way as to ensure the most happiness possible. To better understand this opposition we have focused our eyes only on the territorial wealth or the agricultural industry; because the social interests that are brought into

play there are much less complicated, and because its effects there can be judged without needing to embrace the whole world at a glance, as is requisite when it comes to commercial wealth.

The chrematistic school has posited in principle that wealth grows anyway by either earning more or spending less; its followers very quickly came to conclude that all the pleasures of all those employed in creating wealth are expended; that the human intelligence which appreciates these enjoyments and the freedom that will facilitate their pursuit are the causes of such expenditures; that the nation or better said, its population undertake these expenses, and that a country would get richer all the more quickly if it takes all of its production off the market. There is however something so revolting and absurd about considering as progress: the destruction of happiness, of freedom, and of the very existence of a nation, all for the benefit of wealth, that this consequence has never been expressed,

141

although this necessarily follows from the first principle posited by the school of chrematistics. But what nobody dared saying, we were not afraid to step into that fray and do so. Obtaining wealth, we asserted, reduces the subsistence of the poor. It was reduced to what seemed to be the necessary minimum so that he could continue to live and work. In theory, progress has been represented as attached to large enterprises; in agriculture they are large farms, in the commercial industry large factories; everywhere big capital subjugating thousands of arms to a single will; But to strip these arms off the wills of individuals, we had to make them dependent, make them work on the funds of other people, as under the orders of others; turn them into proletarians, who only contribute to production through their physical strength, who have nothing, who can't count on anything, but who also always threaten the entire social order. The success of all large territorial or commercial operations has always been based on the very cheapness of labor; and we easily brought people who have nothing but their arms, who cannot wait, while the need urges them on, to be satisfied with the least possible wage. So momentarily, the competition raises the rate of their wages. Those who employ them see them without regrets spending this raise in intemperance; for the proletarian is more flexible when his wallet is empty, as he is brought back then more easily in this state represented as normal by any industry, or the cheapness of labor, forming by far the major part of all costs.

But the rich, consulted on how to produce as cheaply as possible, did not trust the competition everywhere and possibly raising their wages. They thought about what proletarians would do to each other with lower wages; and wondered if they could not feed workers with less than the proletarian normally consumed, and get as much or even more work out of him. They demanded, in the name of the progress of wealth, that workers be enslaved to them, so that labor would cost as little as possible, that their end product would be the greatest possible, and that the nation would easily sell all its merchandise

in foreign markets. The negro, he assured, is too barbaric to understand without the aid of the whip the economy and work, and the cultivation of sugar, the most profitable of all, will not pay those fees if the farmer earns as much as the proletarian, if he wants to spend as much as he does. The colonist wasn't asked how the cultivation of sugar was the most profitable of all if it did not pay its expenses; we granted him his slave trade and the slavery of negroes. And today, now that we are finally convinced of the atrocity and the absurdity of this legislation, we are forced to recognize that the slave actually costs more than the proletarian and that he works less. But we still hesitate to suppress an order of things that is as shameful as it is criminal. Civilized nations have not consented to slavery of a race of men different from theirs, for whom they do not feel sympathy, and who moreover is subject to works several thousand leagues away of them, so that they can easily forget the horrors of this state. Their greed however, still got the better of them and spared no less their white compatriots, who work and who suffer under their eyes. The philosophy that still dominates in all the chairs of political economy sees nothing wrong with that; and advises to abandon the proletarian's fate in the fair struggle of swaying individual interests; and to continue in that vein, as the increase in national wealth, which will necessarily result from producing more for less, is of the essence.

Producers of wealth, that is to say the directors of great enterprises either territorial or commercial, therefore sought to replace the working man, the proletarian, here by water, there by wind, elsewhere by fire. In every industry they looked for as many labor-saving devices as they could possibly get their hands on. They chased man in all the various states by which he earned his living, and almost figured that he was expendable in human society. As the industry of cities is split up in an infinite number of professions, as they are constantly being created anew, and as their work is most often destined

for markets too far away for us to easily appreciate either their needs or their limits, we do not immediately realize the effects of this progress, that the philosophers of the new school congratulate us about. These advances amount to nothing more than a cut down of human lives, and their profits are nothing else than the sustenance of a given number of human creatures which are felt to be no longer needed. Production cheapness has enabled the most technically advanced nations, to go further from where they are located in search of consumers, and so far this has resulted in their export trade being extended even faster than their economy on human life.

Workers dismissed from one occupation entered into another; thus these industrial nations, instead of producing as much with fewer hands, or to produce more with the same number of hands, are using more hands to produce infinitely more goods.

The men they make useless and from whom an existence is suppressed are no longer compatriots but strangers. They feel it, and never mind the teachings of the chrematistic school, which no doubt they never heard of anyway, they regard as their enemies the kind of people who undertake to supply the universe with their products, and who thus end up starving their workers at home. The connection of causes with effects however, is not obvious enough in the commercial industry. It does not jump enough into the eyes to stop denying it. But the agricultural industry is limited in a more positive way, and everything becomes more easily appreciable than what is happening the cities. As the territory of a people is circumscribed by its neighbors, amount of land that can be cultivated is still the same. Also, all the savings that are made on labor in agriculture necessarily displaces a proportionate number of farmers. They thus move from the fields to the city, when the city can receive them. But if the city does not offer them work, the nation that ruled their existence useless throws them away from its bosom. England is of all the countries on this earth where savings on agricultural labor have

144

reached the furthest. Its fertile grounds not only are all cultivated, but they have been enriched by all the progress of agricultural science too and yield a considerable output. All this work is done by about a quarter of the English nation, while in the other nations of Europe the cultivators make up three-quarters or four-fifths of the population. There are 34,250,000 acres of land under cultivation in England, and 1,055,982 day laborers; which amounts to a little less than 3 day laborers for 100 acres, or 21 laborers per square mile. In the valley of Nievole in Tuscany, Italy – the cultivation per square mile occupies at least 300 and up to 700 individuals. How does it happen that we never wondered what happened to all these cultivators that England has driven out of her fields?

While the chrematistic school wants to save on men to make wealth, we do not hesitate to say that we must sacrifice wealth to have men.

It would be nice to demonstrate that each of the innovations that we reject is more advantageous from the point of a pecuniary perspective, to which we would still reply: if it decreases the number of happy, virtuous, and intellectually sound individuals, that live on any given area, it is bad. And it is from this point of view that we fought, and we will continue to fight, against this system of industrialism; which has been discounting human life. But we can't let this opportunity escape, to make one feel anew, how much this system is false, even acknowledging the barbaric assumption that one should only calculate the profits or losses for nations, not human life or happiness. Our adversaries agree with us that production cannot continue if consumption does not closely follow and counterbalances it; that wealth ceases to be wealth when its products clutter up the markets, that finally consumers are no less necessary for the success of an industry than the manufacturers themselves. And yet, all the efforts which they brag about tend to limit the number and power of consumers. Either we drive them out of their

homes, reduce them to slavery, or force them to be content with the smallest portion of subsistence and enjoyment with which a man can still live, we always arrive at the same result: decreasing or altogether stopping consumption; disturbing the balance on which our entire social organization is based; throwing a wrench in one of its gears, and that as soon as it stops the whole social mechanism must also come to a stop. Perhaps the chrematistic school will deny that it ever proposed or expelled part of the nation from its homes, or to reduce it to the most absolute destitution, or to subject it to slavery. It is for this very reason that we believe we must clarify the facts; for which we believe also that we must take entire nations and social conditions to serve as examples. It is by examining these great errors, which are causing so much suffering, that we will be able to recognize what the danger of whatever social organization is threatening everywhere; and what is also the remedy for its recurrent calamities, the details of which cannot be studied without shuddering. Many readers may refuse to believe, that, as an overall improvement of the agricultural system, doing away with the peasants who claimed the land and driving them out of their homeland, has never taken place as a rural experience before. However, such an operation was carried out on several occasions, and in various parts under British rule – in England, Scotland and Ireland. The touching poem of Goldsmith, ‘The Deserted Village’, has been painting it for a long time in our imagination. Newspapers today are often filling in the details of this half-military execution euphemistically called ‘the clearing of an estate’. They tell us how such or another great Irish or even English lord, foiled by the opposite party in an election, expelled all his tenants, taking advantage for that by reason of: sometimes not having had a contract, sometimes because some arrears were owed to him; how another great lord resolved to have only Protestants for farmers and chased away all Catholics. But as the spirit of partisanship mingles with

these accusations, the facts become disfigured on either side so that it is most difficult to discern the truth of what happened. So we believe it to be in order to attach such an exposure, made methodically and with calm, of this great agricultural operation: ‘the clearing of an estate’, the clearing of a lordship domain; to wit, the one who had it carried out on the largest scale. In 1820, James Loch, esq., published, in London, a volume in-8° of 354 pages, entitled: ‘Report on bonuses made to the estates of the Marquis of Stafford’. The author, who had been manager of these bonuses himself, was employed by the great lord to whom he was attached to justify them in the public eyes. But it is not this personal cause that must occupy us by analyzing his book. We will look therein for the true story of the great revolution undergone at that time in the population of the highlands of Scotland; and justified by the application of the chrematistic doctrine to their exploitation. And we like to believe all that Mr. Loch asserts about

the humanity he brought to his execution, according to the orders of the powerful family of which he was the agent.

In the space of time which has elapsed since the beginning of this century, the nation of the Gaels, remains Celts, reduced today to three hundred and forty thousand individuals, was almost absolutely expelled in total from their homes by the very ones they regarded as their chiefs, by the lords to whom they had shown, over the course of many centuries, an enthusiastic dedication. All the properties that they had cultivated, from generation to generation, under fixed royalties were taken from them; the fields that they plowed were intended for grazing the flocks, and, adding insult to injury, delivered to foreign shepherds. Its houses and villages were razed or destroyed by fire, and the highlanders of the expelled nation were left no other choice but to raise shacks on the seashore, to try to sustain their miserable existence by fishing, in sight of the mountains from which they had been removed; or to cross the sea to try fetching their fortune in the wilds of America.

147

As this revolution was taking place at a distance of eight hundred miles from London, in an almost barbaric country and whose language is unknown to all the rest of the empire, it was ignored for some time, or at least it only excited little attention. But when it was learned in England that a few residents of northern Scotland had been waiting for the soldiers destined to drive them out of their villages, and sometimes driven them back with stones; that they had been heard asking to be massacred with their wives and children, on the tombs of their fathers, rather than being sent to perish in misery and abandonment, to a world that did not want to receive them, and where no place was reserved for them, this resistance awakened compassion of a generous people. Among the Scottish lords who drove their compatriots off the land that had seen them born, the Marquise of Stafford, heiress of the county of Sutherland, attracted the most attention, either by the extent of her estates, or by the activity with which she urged the accomplishment of the operation, or perhaps by the immensity of its capital, which was poured onto this country while at the same time changing its whole administration. It was learned that about fifteen thousand peasants were forced by her to leave a country as big as one of the medium sized departments of France; that these unfortunates were the only remnants of the many vassals this family had, who during so many centuries had shed their blood for her. We were told that to force them to withdraw, an agent charged with evacuating the county set their houses on fire; and that an old man, others said an old woman, having refused to abandon his hut to go and leave, braving exile and misery, whose presence had not stopped the arsonist, and that the victim had perished in the flames. The public dislike manifested itself by signs which, in a free nation, could neither be ignored nor defied.

The Marquise of Stafford did not think she deserved the harsh judgment

that began to wear on her, and it is to justify in the court of public opinion that the book in which we find these details was composed. Its author has endeavored to

148

prove, and he did so quite successfully on the grounds of: not only the Marquise using her rights that are recognized in law today, but still in its exercise too she did not lose sight of the conservation of existence of her vassals, for whom she felt she was responsible.

As for us, what we believe worthy of study in this book, it is not the proofs of the more or less clever conduct or more or less generosity of a great lady; it is instead the very spirit of a legislation, having abolished ancient limitations on property rights that were established by the use of it. This is the application of the principle that a landowner is the best judge of his own interest and that of the nation, in regards to a property. It is further an application of the principle that agriculture is ever progressing, so that it obtains more utility for the same costs, or the same utility for less. It is the application of the principle that any saving on labor, or, in other words, any elimination of human lives which contribute to an industry is a profit, only if the industry remains the same; and finally, it is a great example of the application of chrematistics to agriculture and its results.

The ancestors of the Marquise of Stafford, from what we learn in the book of her agent, were rulers in the northernmost part of Scotland; of approximately three quarters of Sutherland County. Their possessions measured eight hundred thousand Scottish acres, or one million English acres, and comprises more than four hundred thousand hectares in area. This area is greater than that of the Haut-Rhin department, and slightly smaller than that of the Bas-Rhin department. When as Countess of Sutherland she took inheritance of these estates, which she brought as a dowry to the Marquis of Stafford, since become Duke of Sutherland, the population of all this territory did not exceed fifteen thousand inhabitants. One can't accurately tell how many there were in ancient times; we only know that the Gaels then made southern Scotland tremble, and that we saw battalions of soldiers descend from their mountains, but that today their exhausted nation would be a long way away from being able to still do so.

149

Reduced as it was, the population of Sutherland still seemed far too numerous to the Marquise, because military service wasn't required any longer; while the organization of the county in the olden days was all military.

Only about thirty gentlemen immediately came under the counts; they were called 'Tacksmen', and the district which was assigned to them to rule and to cultivate was called a 'Tack'. These gentlemen had shared their district between their subordinates, who presided over each hamlet and to each valley, and below these were the ploughmen. The 'Tacksmen' were

the only judges of their peasants during peace time, and their captains in war; but the obedience of subordinates was softened by camaraderie and the persuasion of all being part of the same clan. All said they were relatives of their leader, all had the same name. Each leader could use the prerogative of giving or withdrawing at will, to the men who obeyed him, the portions of land they cultivated, and on which they had to live. But everyone, far from thinking of stripping his tenants, was interested in increasing his power, by attracting new plowmen to his captaincy. Besides the revenue received by the Earl of Sutherland on the 'tacksmen', by them over their vassals and their rear vassals, was so little that one had to look at it as a recognition of sovereignty rather than as an annuity. Mr. Loch gives Kintradwell's rental register for 1811, in which we see that until this time each annual benefit amounted to at most a few silver shillings, a few pieces of poultry, and a few days of work.

But on the other hand, any man who was born on the Sutherland's estate, to the total extent of the feudal meaning, was required to pour out his blood and his life in defense of the sovereignty and honor of the clan; which looked at him like kin. Before the tenth century, the Danes, had landed on the coasts, conquering the plains of Caithness and pushed the Gaels back into the mountains. Therefore the Caithness and Sutherland, formerly united under one name and the same government, had been separated by a constant enmity maintained by the

150

difference in language and race. But 'Mhoir-Fhear Chattaibh', as it was called in Gaelic, or the 'great man of Sutherland', had always found his comrades in arms ready to defend him, at the peril of their life, against all his enemies, Danes or Scots, foreigners or domestic.

After the revolution which drove out the Stuarts, private wars in Scotland became rarer and less dangerous, and the kings of England, without ever extending any real authority over these distant provinces, at least wanted the power of the great to appear to be an emanation of theirs. Therefore they encouraged the raising of clan regiments, which they granted to the Scottish lords; and they allowed them to combine the establishment of new militias, within the national system of the clans, so that each one served as support for the other. The 93rd regiment was henceforth granted to the Earl of Sutherland, and his remuneration from the Crown then became the main revenue of the family; while the gentlemen of the county obtained theirs from their captain, giving up part of his pay; 'tacks', land grants commensurate with their rank in the regiment. They procured, in turn, recruits under the same conditions; by sharing these land concessions between their subordinates.

Thus land tenure lost its old character of liberality. The concession was no longer an act of munificence of the head of the clan, but had evolved into a pecuniary market, in which the 'Mhoir-Fhear Chattaibh' sought to win. He had needs indeed: he was called to court in England, and 'the great man of Sutherland' found himself very small in the midst of English pomp, luxury and the opulence of London; he felt very humiliated by this shortcoming,

proverbially reproached by the English to all its nation. All his officers, all his tacksmen in their garrison, owed in turn to face the ruinous expenses in England; at the same time taking on the taste of a luxury that they did not know before. They redoubled their

151

efforts to extract from the plowman all that they could possibly obtain from him. But at the same time they ceased to encourage and support the industry of the country; they were no longer satisfied with the tartan, the plaid fabrics of their clan, their claymores forged in their mountains, the oat cakes that they had in lieu of bread; food, drink, clothes, arms, tools, furnishings, everything was already beginning to be supplied to them by commerce, and no longer by their domestic industry; and in return they had very little to offer in trade, their products were of little value; the grains with which they were content, the woolens with which they wove their coarse clothes were not worth those of England, and could not bear the cost of transport. Their harsh Scottish climate could not provide for the consumption of the rich, and that in the time when the customs of the rich were rough too. Since the chief and his officers asked for money to get all the luxuries they could no longer do without; it was however necessary to cultivate not to consume, but to export, to sell and get that money; yet if anything was sold it was done only with contempt. All local industries were disappearing; in a country where there is barely a dry day between two days of rain or snow, profitable work to be done under cover could no longer be found. The poor ceased to have an occupation for all seasons of the year, and for all the members of a clan, the idleness increased misery. The population was decreasing rapidly; but, at the discretion of those who wanted to improve these large areas to obtain more revenue, not fast enough apparently.

This population was fairly evenly distributed over the entire surface area of Sutherland. Each valley contained a hamlet; the alluvial soils had been intended for the cultivation of oats and barley; one made cakes from the first, and distilled 'whiskey' from the second. The mountains, covered with rather thick grass, were abandoned to the herds which provided the milk, meat, wool, and leathers. All the needs of the population were thus met, as long as it had been able to be satisfied with these

152

coarse products. However, the breed of horned beasts, accustomed to the meager nourishment, was weak, the wool of the sheep was rough; fields of barley and oats were only barely cultivated; because it was most often abandoned to women; men believed they were only made for war, or at most for the painful surveillance of the herds in the mountains. They were adventurous, brave, passionately attached to their nationality, their clan, their language, their costume, the honor of their race, their leaders, and their mountains, but not very industrious. As the work of their wives was sufficient to provide for their subsistence, they cherished their idleness.

The whole country, having for resources only plowing and grazing, in a climate as harsh as that of the high mountains of Switzerland, and also exposed to frosts both late and early, every day became ever more poor instead of making progress; it was without manufactures, without much commerce, without money and trading posts, no major roads were laid out, and so no communications between different parts of the county was possible, except for foot traffic which meant for most of the inhabitants. And far from being obedient to the laws of England, nobody followed them even as they were on the books to govern them.

On the other hand these villagers had gathered in their huts all that was necessary for their subsistence; they didn't feel the need for more, they lived happily; and then even as the calamities of heaven sometimes destroyed their harvests, and decimated them with famine with their flocks, they knew how to submit to it with resignation, because the hand of man had no part in their suffering.

Between the year 1811 and the year 1820, these fifteen thousand inhabitants, forming about three thousand families, were driven out, or, to use the mellow expression of Mr. Loch, who had presided over the operation, 'removed and relocated' from the entire interior of the county. All their villages had been demolished or burnt down, and all their fields converted into pastures (Improvement, etc., by J. Loch, p. 92). A similar operation was made, almost simultaneously, by the other seven or eight lords who owned the rest of Sutherland County, or

153

an area of over two hundred and fifty thousand English acres; much more, almost all the lords in the north of Scotland then acted in the same way, or were quick to follow this example. Mr. Loch assures us, however, that the Marquise of Stafford has shown much more humanity than any of her neighbors; she took care of the fate of those she moved, she offered a retreat on her own lands; and taking back from them seven hundred and ninety-four thousand acres of land, which they had been in the possession of since time immemorial, she generously left them about six thousand, or two acres per family.

These six thousand acres opened to serve as a refuge for the small tenants were previously fallow, and did not render anything to the new owners.

The Marquise, however, did not grant them free of charge; she subjected them to an average annuity of two shillings and a half per acre, and made no longer leases than for seven years; but he promised to renew the lease for another seven years, if the land was well cultivated. (Ib., p. 107.)

The seven hundred and ninety-four thousand acres of which the Marquise of Stafford regained possession and were divided by Mr. Loch, her agent, in twenty-nine large farms, highly unequal in extent. These are larger than the Seine department, which itself comprises forty-six thousand one hundred and eighty-one hectares, and would therefore not form more than one-ninth of the area of the Earls of Sutherland. These farms, intended only for grazing sheep, are each inhabited by only one family, and like the industry they introduce into the country is new, they hardly ever employ

Scots, but only farmhands from England. Seventeen gentlemen, however, or former 'tacksmen' of Sutherland, took possession of as many farms from the Marquise, despite the national prejudices which had attached the idea of derogation from his old to this new occupation. The other twelve are English. One hundred and thirty-one thousand sheep were already replacing, in 1820, the brave who once shed their blood in defense of the

154

Mhoir-FhearChattaibh (Ibid. p. 147), and their number is doubtless greatly increased today. No human voice sounds any more in the narrow gorges of these mountains, instanced in other times by the battles of an ancient race; no one recalls its glorious memories any longer; the valleys no longer have hamlets, no instances of joy or pain disturb these vast solitudes; but the heir to the county of Sutherland who is now living retired in England, at several hundred miles away from the homeland of his maternal ancestors, took charge of enjoying and resting thanks to the expulsion of his former vassals. He is now displaying a royal pump at Trentham Castle, with all its luxuries contributed by English factories.

We have no doubt that this upheaval of property, habits, affections, and even the entire existence of a small nation, has increased the already colossal fortune of the Countess of Sutherland. But Mr. Loch is keen to demonstrate that she has increased the wealth of the country also; that there is more money, more activity, more industry, more luxury pleasures; that all Sutherland is now in a progressive state of prosperity, having been in a stationary state for centuries. We believe in fact that by judging the state of the country solely according to the principles of the chrematistic school, and by identifying prosperity as such, Sutherland has indeed progressed.

Several routes of forty, forty-five, fifty miles in length, already cross the whole country; bridges in stone and iron, some of which are remarkably bold, were raised at the expense of the Countess, now Duchess, on the great rivers; jetties and dikes stop flooding, ports have been opened for trade, stagecoaches travel the country roads to the small cities built at its ends; hostels, and trading posts, were built by the Marquise of Stafford, and from the year 1820, the export of four hundred and fifteen thousand pounds of fine wool gave a sense of how much wealth could one day emerge from a country that was able to be

155

developed with such an admirable economy and inhabitants, and work, and happiness.

Let individual interests act, we are told, that no legislator should pretend to be more skillful than any owner himself would be in the administration of his fortune. If he is rich, active, intelligent, he will create the prosperity of a poor and wild country, and the more his heritage will be extended, the fewer obstacles he will encounter in his useful projects.

All those almost barren fields, which miserably fed restless and anxious vassals, quicker to wield their ancient sword, their claymore, than their spade, will feed sheep, whose wool will feed factories and supply markets in remote regions. But then what about the inhabitants! - Mr. Loch assures us that the fate of these thousands of families exiled from their homeland was not so deplorable as predicted by their fears and sorrows. A few, true enough, did not want to take anything from the family which drove them from their homes. The 'Gunn' clan, or the 'Mac-Hamish', abandoning the Kildonan Mountains and the valleys of Naver and Helmsdale, left the county altogether, and the author does not tell us what has become of them. But the remnants of these clans, as well as thirty-two families of 'Strathbrora' left for America in the 1818s and 1819s, the others, he assures us, have almost all accepted the plots of land offered to them by the Marquise of Stafford. Rejected onto the edges of this immense domain, between the sea and the mountains, they found land suitable for cultivation, and Mr. Loch asserts, which must seem very strange, since it is located in a belt only half a mile wide, edged along the sea, a belt hitherto left fallow, that can indeed provide Sutherland with profits through the production of cereals. These unfortunate exiles, known by the name of 'small tenants', received relief, or so he claimed, from the owner to help them build their new houses, encouragement to clear their new lands; and even the gardens, off which they must live, were fairly prominently highlighted.

In all these families the young people deployed the

156

adventurous character which seems peculiar to the mountain people of Scotland. Strangers as they were to the sea and its habits, they bought or built boats; they had rapid and venturous apprenticeships under the boatmen whom the Marquise of Stafford had commissioned to train them, and they went on out fishing on the big banks for cod and herring; which alternately, and in different seasons, visit these shores to spawn. Vast stores were built in Helmsdale and Brora, to cure and prepare fish; merchant houses from Scotland and England sent agents there, and fishing, increasing from year to year, 1814 to 1819; and has become an abundant source of wealth which is all exported instead of being consumed in the country. (Ibid., p. 125).

Mr. Loch concludes, from what we have just cited, that the projects initiated by the Marquise of Stafford for the improvement of these lands in Sutherland County had been a full success. Not only did she reap immense benefits from it; she also quickly made the county, which depended on her, pass from barbarism to civilization. If she caused a most painful anguish to this small group of people whose destiny was entrusted to her, in return, says our author, she has opened up a wider field to its industry, and she has tried to soften their sorrows, by offering them hope for a future of more ease.

We cannot help but notice how much this way of hurrying the march of civilization resembles the one that Mehemet-Ali implemented at around

the same time in Egypt; and he too was vividly celebrated for a time by the chrematistic school, as the restorer of commerce and the arts. He also confused in his person the rights of the sovereign with those of a land owner; he too judged the prosperity of the state, not by the abundance or security enjoyed by its inhabitants, but by traffic activity, export value, profit annuitants; he too traced paths, opened canals, built bridges and dikes. He covered Egypt with works of art; he called on scientists, engineers, industrialists, that he wanted to found factories of all types;

157

and he too, in conclusion, perhaps was wanting to do good, but especially had the increase of his own revenue in mind.

In his calculations the lives of men only seemed to him as numbers, and he took them into account like cotton bales; the same as the Marquise of Stafford's bales of wool. He calculated, but the affections, the memories, and the hopes of the unfortunate, in no way were elements subject to any calculation.

The Duchess of Sutherland is said to be a woman of high skill; she intelligently administers her immense fortune; she increases it and she prepares it for new developments in the future. Moreover it advances, as needed, for what she sees as the enhancement of the country, capital that would never have been provided so quickly by other individuals, or even by shareholder companies. But who can predict what successors will be inclined to do, will they have as much liberality, humanity, and intelligence? The immense opulence causes immense squandering, and many peers from England, with their colossal fortunes in real estate are laden with debts. They are ruining their estates, they show themselves greedy in dealings with their farmers, they allow their lands to be seized by their creditors. So therefore, in seven years, in fourteen years, at the end of each term of their lease, these disoriented families from Sutherland will be again exposed to errors, false calculations, dissipation, greed, folly, and injustices by an owner, who, without any responsibility will hold their fate in his hands.

Assuming, with Mr. Loch, that the Marquise executed her projects with as much humanity as with prudence, we still should shudder at the idea that the law, as it is interpreted in England, allowed all these people to be expelled from their homes, without any necessity of providing in any way for their subsistence and fate to come; that the government would have lent the support of a military force for this expulsion, and that that this was done more than once; that finally, according to Mr. Loch himself, other landowners in the county have not been so human.

The population of the Gruids on Lochshin, he said, was

158

considerable; it does not appear that any plot of land has been assigned to these people, nor that they had received any compensation at the time of their expulsion, which took place in the winter of 1818.

This expulsion of the Gaelic people from their ancestral grounds might well be considered legal; but dare we say that it is fair? Isn't there also a striking connection, although a strange contrast as well, between the slave trade and the expulsion of the Scots? And the crime of those who transport unfortunate Africans to plow foreign fields in Martinique, should it not be compared to that of the men who push unfortunate Scots away from the coasts of Europe, whom they no longer allow to plow their own fields? This ancient nation of Celts or Gaels, which was settled, not only on the British Isles but in Gaul, as well as parts of central Europe, Spain, and Italy; will it be chased, in the name of the laws, from these very rocks where it has never been defeated, off those rocks where it had steadfastly maintained its independence lost everywhere else? These representatives of the oldest masters in Europe, now at last to be deported? It is through a cruel abuse of legal forms, it is through an iniquitous usurpation, that the 'tenants', be it in the County of Sutherland, or in the rest of Scotland, are regarded as having no right to the land which they have occupied for centuries, and that their former captains are authorized to violate the contracts which have united for so many generations the farmer with his lord.

English jurists have constantly assimilated all political rights to properties, and they stood up for their titles. They wanted to see a property in the all-political power of the lords, as they claimed to see one in the exclusive right of certain bourgeois to elect members of Parliament, or municipal magistrates, as they claim to see one in the right of the Church to its dignities and its revenue; forgetting that when functions are instituted for the benefit of the people, it is to the people that the funds by which they are remunerated belong.

159

The English jurists hardly wanted to admit that the leaders of society, in its progress, had the right to remove powers which were dependent on that progress; at the very least they wanted to retain the remuneration that was attached to that progress if they were to take over the duties that society had earlier taken care of as a whole. At the same time, instead of focusing on institutions different from their own, to equally care for the interests of all those they affected, they never wanted to consider that only a single person would be profiting from progress; and placed that profit in the same class as as the possession of a field or a house would render its owner upon a sale.

The vast expanse of seigneurial domains is not a condition peculiar to England. Throughout the empire of Charlemagne, throughout the West, entire provinces had been usurped by warlike leaders, who made them be cultivated for their own account by the vanquished, by slaves, or even sometimes by their own comrades in arms. In the ninth and tenth centuries – Maine, Anjou, Poitou, were, as far as provinces reckon, three large farms rather than three principalities. Switzerland which, in so many ways, does remind one of Scotland for its lakes and mountains, by its climate which so often deceives the plowman's hope, by the character, manners and

habits of its people, was even at that time shared between a small number of lords. If the counties of Kyburg, Lentzburg, Habsburg, and Gruyères, had been protected by English law, they would be finding themselves today in the very same condition where the Earls of Sutherland were twenty years ago. Some of them might have acquired the same taste for improvements, and several commonwealths would have been driven out of the Alps to make way for herds of sheep. But whatever may lie at the origin the law of property rights, the legislation did not cease, during eight centuries, in all continental Europe. To guarantee and improve the fate of the feudatory, the vassal, the serf, who reported to him; to strengthen the independence of the peasant, to cover him with the shield of conscription, to change his customs into rights, to protect him

160

from the exactions of his lord, and from gradually raising its taxes with the changing rank of properties. The law gave the Swiss peasant the guarantee of perpetuity, while in the north of the British empire it is left up to anyone Scottish Lord whether he gives this same guarantee, or whether he leaves peasants in a precarious situation. Compare the two countries and judge the two systems.

In France also the condition of the tenant has consistently improved. The French vassal was originally either a vanquished, or a slave, or, in the most favorable supposition, it was an 'arimane', or a free man, who had renounced his freedom to become 'leude', and who undertook to return to his lord certain feudal services in return for land he received as a gift from him. But what was missing in its original rights had been gradually granted by use; not only has his property been recognized, it has become equal in all respects to that of its donor. The Gaelic tenant, on the contrary, had never been conquered; he did not hold his fields from the liberality of his lord but he was originally co-owner with his captain, or rather with his clan. However this captain that he accompanied in war, and to whom he obeyed for their common advantage, considered him first as his friend and his parent, then as his soldier, then as his vassal, later as his farmer, and finally as a plowman for hire, that he was willing to make suffer for his own benefit on the soil of the common homeland, but that he was master of as soon as he no longer finds it to be in his interest to keep him.

It should not be forgotten that in fact: the highlands of Scotland, the Gaelic mountains, never suffered the yoke of a foreign invasion; that the feudal system never became the law of the country, even though national customs dating from antiquity observed in neighboring countries were assimilated there in an adapted system; that the very listing of names that we think we can understand in the English language, no longer is the language of the country, and that the Earl of Sutherland is known by the Gaels as the 'great man from south of Caithness'.

We cannot hope to find in a barbaric nation, that did not even have the use of writing, the authentic documents on how these great family associations known in Scotland as the clan,

nor on the successive reunion of several clans into a single sovereignty such as that of Sutherland.

But their very name 'Klaan' means 'children' in Gaelic. All their uses, all their reciprocal relationships, all their affections, are indeed founded on the tradition which persuades that they are children of the same family; all their rights were indeed those of children of the same father sharing a common heritage. They were not subjected to any other subordination than that of which the common defense made them necessary. The instability of land sharing did not weaken the property rights of the large family either; whatever belonged to the district where they had settled was theirs. Such were the public law of the Celts, as also of the Germans; and as to the latter, which were organized much more for the war than for cultivation, lest families become too attached to the fields they plowed, they should change lots, even as often annually. All were entitled to everything among the Scots, but each person's field could pass to its neighbor's, either as it was assigned to him from the outset, or as an extension or restriction of its soil according to the forces of the family cultivating it, or that portions of land were assigned as a reward for services rendered to the country. There is, moreover, no country in Europe where one cannot find, even fairly recently, traces of temporary sharing and community variable domain. In Scotland it was sought that the division and subdivision of land indicated and maintained the subordination between the soldiers and their leader. The 'Great man' of each clan exercised, maybe even at times usurped from the community the right to make these distributions alone; he gave and took back the various 'tacks' of his land to his officers, depending on whether they had been more or less useful to him at war. But though he could thus reward or punish militarily members of the clan, he could not diminish

in any way the property of the clan itself. The favored individual while different, the duty of his service was still equal. Military magistrates established for the good of all acquired or lost a more or less considerable part in this national domain, without Sutherland ceasing to belong entirely to the men of Sutherland. The land tenure was always the same; their contribution for public defense, their royalty to the lord who would be leading into combat, and keeping order in their homes, were never subject to increase.

When civilization began to progress, the lords, with the language and dress of England, also began to adopt the customs and way of thinking of the English. They no longer understood or cared to understand the national contracts of the Celts; and to give it the functionality used among civilized peoples; instead they wrote it down, while at the same time granting their vassals the 'tacks' or portions of land, for a predetermined time. They thus seemed to make them a great concession, because previously they could have dismissed them at will. On the contrary, it was a usurpation of the

community, since in the past, by dismissing one, they had no choice but to replace them by others, under absolutely the same conditions. In a similar vein, as soon as they began to distribute these farm lands, they insinuated in the contract that each time the lease was renewed they could impose new conditions, or worsen the royalties of their tenants. By this secret usurpation, the lords of the Gaelic lands, who, properly speaking, were only entitled to an invariable rent on the property of their clan, changed it for the unlimited ownership of the domain which paid them this rent. However, they were far from foreseeing, or their vassals were far from fearing that they would someday take advantage of the renewal of leases, not to simply increase the laborers' fee, but to expel them outright. Before coming to such a barbaric one-sided resolution, the lord had to have absolutely stopped sharing opinions, feelings, trusts as point of honor, with his compatriots; he had to have not

163

only ceased to believe himself to be their father or their brother, but even to feel Scottish. It was necessary that a base greed had stifled him in that feeling of consanguinity; which their common ancestors had counted on, while abandoning to his good faith the destiny of his people. It is as soon as similar sentiments take a hold in opinions, in interests, in the respective position of the various members of society, that the country's legislator must intervene so that the whole nation is not left to the mercy of a small number of greedy and reckless men. It is not about soliciting the pity of the lords, but establishing the rights of the Gaelic people. It is about ensuring that in the future no lord can any longer come to conclusions in line with the principles of the chrematistic school: that man can in any way be superfluous in human society; that there can be economy, progress, prosperity, to cut off the nation from its soil; or, it could even be a question of reasoning inconsistently from well-stated principles. If the Marquise of Stafford had the right to replace the people of an entire county by twenty-nine families of foreigners, and some hundreds of thousands of sheep, we must hasten to abolish, for her and for all the others in her position, such an odious right.

It is already a great misfortune for a State having allowed the reunification of territorial properties into a very small number of hands.

When only a single man has the say over a territory which is to suffice for several hundred families, it is his luxury that replaces their ease and the revenue that would have nourished their health and virtues are dispelled by his follies. What could possibly become of a nation, if the owner of a county imagines that his interest are in opposition to that of its inhabitants, and that it suits him to replace men with sheep or oxen? The establishment of territorial property couldn't possibly have had that as its purpose, nor a law that would be guaranteeing such a whim as valid. People recognized territorial property in the belief that it was useful both to those who had nothing, as to those who had some thing; but society is shaken to the core when property rights are put in opposition to its rights as a nation.

A count has no more the right to expel the inhabitants of his county from their homes than a king has to expel from his country the inhabitants of his kingdom. The most despotic of monarchs, if he made such an attempt today, would soon learn the consequences of having exceeded the limits of an authority, that the great lords of England took upon themselves with impunity! The fewer they are, the more dangerous it would be for them to stand in opposition to the nation, and to have the law of the latter submit to their preferences. That they do not say out loudly, when it comes to their interest, as the agent of the Marquise of Stafford let slip out: "Why, in this case, would we adopt a rule different from that which was followed in all the other cases? Why should the absolute authority of the owners of a property be abandoned and sacrificed for the public interest, and on grounds which only concern the public? (Loch, p. 41, note.) Well, if they ever come to believe that they do not need the people, those people will in turn believe that they have no need of them. If they estimate that three hundred and forty thousand brave highlanders, of the Gaelic race, can be replaced, with a profit for them, by four million sheep, then these highlanders could, with still more facility, find useful replacements for thirty or forty, or perhaps even for a tenfold of lords, who had ceased to be their compatriots.

FIFTH ESSAY

Condition of Irish Cultivators, and the Causes of their Distress.

Our intention, by bringing together, completing, and publishing these Studies, was above all to probe the open wounds of society in these modern times. We have been made deeply aware of the misery of the poor, of the frightening growth of a once hardly-noticeable class of people, that of the proletarians, which now threatens the existence of civilization. We saw that the more a country made progress towards its commercial activity and towards the accumulation of wealth, the more we saw the number of men who have no share in this wealth, no guarantee of their existence, no past and no future. Men who, living on the labor of their hands, sometimes get amply remunerated for their efforts, but which any day, without their fault, without a lack of prudence on their part and failing to be protective, can see themselves deprived of their subsistence. We have seen how, by the very progress of wealth, and in accordance with the principles of the school of chrematistics, one occupation after another, one condition after another, become uprooted from the soil or any other place of work where these were once established and whose workers precipitated in proletarian activities, but from which a novel societal failure now makes them fall

into pauperism, or in that state of irremediable poverty to which society is required to provide assistance, but which however it pronounces unable to relieve.

This is when so much of the population, sometimes even the majority of the nation, has become a foreign entity

166

to the soil of the motherland, indifferent to its institutions, even the enemy of a public order which is oppressing it; which the political effort of minds put in place to strengthen classic liberal power in the institutions of most civilized nations.

We have tried to show that by insisting on counting as equal the voices of individuals so prodigiously unequal in knowledge, experience, virtues and force of will, one did not find in the vote of the majority the true national vote. We have shown that after having created this multitude of destitute proletarians, if we attributed sovereignty to quantity, we should not hope that they would out of their own interests, be providing for those of the nation. We finally looked at what could be done for them in the political order, and, for truly a government of all – which institutions would need to conform to public reason. Today we are studying another side of the same question. Ever more struck by the danger that threatens public order, since physical strength is really in the hands of those men without guarantee, without a future, who are exposed every day to privations which are all the more painful, as they constantly have before their eyes the spectacle of opulence. We have asked for an account of their existence in terms of the principles of chrematistics, or the theory of wealth formation, and we also looked for what in terms of real economic policy could be done through the distribution of wealth; for that a threatening cause of disorder was never introduced in the principles of ruling the house and the community. We see the universal tendency of separating the action of capital from that of human physical activity in wealth accumulation; we see that in every occupation, in each profession, what we call progress, is the meeting in a single center of on the one hand: immense capital, with all the assistance that can be given to it in applying science and a human intelligence of the highest order; and, on the other hand, the subordination of man's physical strength, of several thousands of arms, of all the arms that perform work. It is the supremacist will that reigns, and which alone has the say over all thinking, combining, and who deserves what pay for whatever effort; or more briefly, we see that it is the progress

167

recommended by chrematistics, it is the strengthening of the aristocracy of money, and the creation of proletarians.

But it is not enough to untangle this general tendency, it is also necessary to study the fate of the various occupations, on account of the way that

chrematistics is destroying the independence of the little guys, depriving them of their guarantees, forcing them to descend from the rank of masters to that of mercenaries, and accumulating, or rather striving to accumulate wealth in a few hands, reducing all workers to the most miserable pittance, under the pretext of cheap labor. This study of various occupations can only be done by focusing our eyes in turn on a single country, a single occupation; that by going down to local details, attested to by reliable witnesses, who often collected them for a completely different purpose than that which we propose to achieve. Chrematistics has long deceived us through generalities and abstractions; while claiming to be only a material science of facts and numbers; it has long lost our eyes, by pointing to an invisible horizon that is long since out of view. On the contrary, we claim to focus our point of view on a single country, a single era, and a single occupation. We have, before everything else, put our mind to studying the cultivator class, because it is ordinarily, and should always be by far the more numerous; because it is the most necessary for everyone's existence, because it is the easiest to make happy; and because its aptitude for the military is the best guarantee of the power and independence of nations, while this love of order is the pledge of their inner peace.

The cultivator class is, in most countries of Europe, associated in some way with property. It harbors, by ancient affections, as by its interests, the soil which saw it come into being. It hopes to see its offspring stay there similarly attached, and it entrusts its future fate to the guarantee of perpetual rights. However we find in any country which can pass for prosperous, a small number of cultivators reduced to the rank of proletarians: these are the day laborers, who only own their spade and their hoe, and who are called by

the other cultivators in moments of pressing works, out of fear that the families who are associated with land ownership cannot by themselves accomplish all the work which needs to be done in time. Day laborers can be let go in short order; no one is committed to maintain them; they have no future and no past; and always sense to being on the verge of extreme poverty. They aren't concerned with the industry they are working on; the good or the bad luck of the crops does not matter to them, and their own interests are diametrically opposed to that of the men who employ them; because they want the price of labor to be high and the price of food, low. The existence of day laborers is a certain a disorder and a danger in society. But as long as they are small in number, we can look at them as one of those inevitable disadvantages of any social order, and even find that alongside a certain evil, they no doubt do some good too. The writers of the chrematistic school however, have been working for some time to persuade us that the everyday state of cultivators is society's normal state of affairs; that when one wants agricultural production to function under the greatest technological know-how and highest efficiency of capital, the soil must be divided up into large farms, operated by rich and educated men, who don't work themselves but who invent or are setting the stage

for inventing the most perfected implements; who advance funds, who calculate markets, and who alone possess the will and intelligence to direct the thousands of arms they set to work.

This is precisely the same theoretical approach with which chrematistics is applied to the industrial arts. This teaching philosophy is now widespread throughout Europe; public opinion adopted it in theory, even where it has in no way passed practical muster. Landowners and capitalists believe it to be in full accordance with their interest; and cultural inevitabilities, like the creation of a proletariat, threaten to invade all the countries where the peasant has been the happiest to date. It's a sufficient reason to study the effects of this system in countries where it is already universally in force. The British empire is where the chrematistic school has most completely subjugated opinion, it is the one where

169

legislation has had the most powerful influence, it is the only one where it has reduced almost the entire working class to a state that is considered normal. It is therefore of great interest to the whole European civilization, as to the happiness of humanity, to consider the effects of this system there where it is fully in play. The chrematistic school's slogan to: 'always produce more and always cheaper' has been all convincing to rural works operators. We have just seen how these, in conformance to this advice, judged the work of the Scots to be superfluous, calculated that it was not worth the subsistence of the worker; and resolved to get rid of him. We will next discover how these same kind of entrepreneurs don't find Irish labor fruitful either, consequently reducing it to the most miserable existence to which a human being can descend. In another Essay we will see how these same agricultural contractors, having acquired the soil of the Antilles, the richest and most fertile in existence anywhere, in the most beautiful climate in the world, only found the day laborer's work fruitful by reducing him to slavery. How they degraded the negro to the rank of brutes only making use of his physical strength, without imparting the least encouragement to his intelligence nor his morality, without granting him any of the pleasures of man.

It will no doubt be astonishing to see us take our principal examples to be occurring in the British empire; and more over, since we declare at the same time to be looking at the most civilized, the most enlightened, the most religiously free, and the most compassionate of those who exert a great influence on the earth. For this nation is also the one that perhaps produced the best observers, who can best report on the facts. Besides, these are not moral feelings which are in default here, the nation suffers from the effects of the fatal theory it adopted regarding the increase of wealth. It is this fatal theory which made legislators forget to consider man and keeping only things in mind; still blinding the public conscience when it struggles to remedy excesses of misery, often thereby even exacerbating its effects by all the efforts made to relieve them.

Before drawing conclusions from the facts, and especially before seeking any remedies, it is important for us to put these facts clearly before the reader's eyes. We want to let him know that Ireland, is the country where the poor population is at the same time the most numerous and the most miserable, the most degraded without exception, in the world.

Fortunately, to do so, we have the testimony of an observer worthy of all our confidence, and to whom the British nation has for its part given all its own, a Mr. H.D. Inglis, whose 'Voyage to all parts of Ireland, during the fine season in the year 1834', is the most complete, the most faithful, the most touching picture of the state of this unhappy country. An analysis of his book seems to us to be the foremost demonstration to put before the eyes of our readers, the disastrous effects of a false system (1).

The distressing and frightening state of Ireland is not, true enough, being absolutely ignored by those who deal with the social science. We know in general that the Irish population is miserable and oppressed; that part of its character even makes habitual use of its own misfortunes in order to fight its opponents it strives to make odious. Sure enough the continent, those who imagine they are showing patriotism by professing hatred against the English, all attribute the sufferings of Ireland to covetousness, to cruelty, to the lack of pity on the part of its oppressors. The English, on their side, often protest that the Irish are an ungovernable people, that they are not capable of order, completing any job, and without any sense of economy; in short, that they will never reach either industrial development or their freedom. Fanatical Protestants further accuse the misfortunes of Ireland to the spirit of Catholicism, and the intriguing character of its clergy. Catholics in turn attribute the misery of Ireland to the confiscation of property by which the National Church was richly endowed, to the concession of these goods to rival clergymen without flock,

(1) A Journey throughout Ireland, during the spring, summer and autumn of 1834, by H.D. Inglis; in two volumes. (Whittaker and Co. 2nd edition 1835).

to the obligation where the faithful are to pay tithes to priests whom they regard as heretics, and to maintain at the same time by contributions that are voluntarily made, the worship demanded by their consciences. And while all these reciprocal accusations have some basis in truth, none of them have yet reached the true source of perpetrated evil.

However their conflict has further soured the suffering; in that its violent animosity resulted in the parties constantly being on the verge of coming to blows. The people distrust the government, the government distrusts the people, and the maintenance or restoration of civil order has become an almost impossible task in the midst of such bitter hatred and anarchy.

All of these inflicted evils are yet all too real; as they contribute to worsen the condition of this unfortunate people, and make the correction of the current state of affairs all the more difficult. This morally objective

behavior however is only symptomatic, it is the consequence of something even more serious and deeper, it isn't a cause. Ireland is reduced to this appalling distress, because Ireland is a country where almost the entire mass of the population has absolutely no share in property, because the Irish nation is entirely a nation of proletarians.

All land in fact belongs to a small number of families, all capital to a small number of rich people, and apart from these two very elite categories, the whole nation as it truly is, has only its arms to live. It awaits nourishment every day from work; but the job is impossible if the rich do not agree to advance land to the plowman, or capital to the industrial entrepreneur.

Need relentlessly urges a nation, only consisting of unfortunate workers; universal competition established for obtaining work under conditions that are only advantageous for the rich. No laws, no regulations, no point of honor prevents them from taking full advantage of the benefits offered to them. The life of all the poor is somehow subject to an iniquitous and mad game of bidding. The land is most often leased by small

172

plots, and on a very short lease, or even without a lease, and the ones who offers the highest rent; and a rent which, even in the best of years, barely leaves them enough to miserably live on, is preferred over all rivals.

Similarly, work is offered at a discount for industrial day laborers, either in the cities, or in the countryside; and the one who is satisfied with the least wage, a wage barely sufficient to obtain a coarse meal, become the only ones employed. This universal competition, which has been embellished under the name of 'unlimited freedom of industry', is still the celebrated ideal of several economists; such competition is the fatal status towards which the social organization of laborers tends to settle among all peoples of modern Europe. It is therefore not curiosity alone or sympathy which prompts us to read, to study, with all the contemplation of which we are capable, the picture of the miserable Irish traced by Mr. Inglis; it is also a return to ourselves and to our own country; it is a national interest, and the interest of all of mankind. This turn out to be one of the biggest problems of social science, which the present moment calls us to solve; and however painful the reflection on these illuminations may be, we must not hesitate at all endeavor to see, hear, and know everything.

Mr. Inglis, whose description of Ireland has already obtained in England an acknowledgment that anyone no longer dreams of disputing, began his explorations with all the advantages of a good observer.

He had already published a Voyage to Spain, another about Tyrol, and a description of the British Channel Islands, but he did not know Ireland until the spring of 1834. He arrived there without prejudice, and in fact he hardly allows us to recognize to which party, or to which religious sect he belongs; while the fury of the local factions did their utmost to lead astray the people in whose midst he was about to travel. He was determined to see everything, to judge everything for himself. He had been given letters of introduction to men of all opinions, of all ranks, of all religions.

“On leaving Dublin,” he says (volume I, chap. 2, p. 21), “I was endowed with more than one hundred and thirty letters of recommendation

173

to people of all statuses, from the representative of royalty to the farmer (I introduced myself to the plowman); for people of all opinions, from the Orangeman Justice of the Peace of Down or Derry, to the Catholic ‘repealer’ of Kilkenny or Tipperary (who wants to restore Ireland to its former independence); from the dignitary of the Protestant church to the country vicar, from the Catholic bishop to the parish priest. I do not need to tell those who know Ireland how much these letters were proliferating others. Before returning to Dublin, I had presented at least three times the number of recommendations with which I had left.”

Our traveler had arrived in Dublin on a beautiful morning in the spring of 1834; he left after a long enough stay, in other words – short, pulling out straight at noon, along the Saint-George canal to Wexford; from there he headed west, following the southern coasts of the island, then north, following the western coasts, not without having also traveled much, if not the most of the interior, and followed in almost all their entire length the magnificent banks of the Shannon. He followed, from sunrise to sunset, even the shores of the northern sea; and he finally came down from Belfast to Dublin, thus having made a complete tour of the island. He traveled in turn by stagecoach, in country buggies, by boat, on horseback, and even on foot, and he was almost always accompanied by his wife, whom he only names once, however, to explain why this earned him the thoughtfulness of country people.

“I had,” he says (volume II, chap. 16, p. 290), “another advantage. In almost all my journeys of discovery, through mountains and valleys, as in the suburbs of the cities, I was accompanied by my wife. One can chuckle, but those who know Irish peasants will easily understand how useful it was to my goal. The wretched people in Ireland are in such a miserable state, and there is so little understanding between them and the higher classes, that the approach of a well-dressed person towards the door of their cabin, or the enclosure of their farm,

174

immediately arouses their suspicion, but the appearance of a woman disarms them instantly; bailiffs, police officers, tithes or excise collectors, in short no official persons, would be accompanied by women in the performance of their duties. Besides, there is so little communication between the aristocracy of Ireland and the lower classes, as the entry of a lady into a cabin is considered to be a very special condescension, and excites a proportionate confidence in return. Who does, moreover, not know how easily the affection of an Irish mother is won by showing a little kindness to her children; how much a caress to one, a pat given to another, opens her heart; how much, in conclusion, the laughing face of a woman who, in entering a cottage, pronounces the words: ‘God bless all

those who are here,' easily obtains confidences which would be refused to all the commissioners of all Governments?"

Ireland is, in general, a graceful and picturesque country. The richness of its soil, the vigor of its vegetation, the magnificence of its waters and the elegant cut of its mountains, its deep gulfs, its innumerable lakes, present a continual attraction to lovers of beautiful nature. And although on a small scale, Mr. Inglis, without pretending to write a travel guide, associates you directly with its pleasures.

It inspires a keen desire to see the banks of the Suire; the magnificent course of the Shannon, in its flow from lake to lake, presenting a different beauty in each of them; the enchanting sites he encounters from Clifden to the Killeries. It is nearly from having left Dublin that he walks towards the first of those landscapes celebrated among painters, the 'gentle valley of Avoca'. "I stayed three days here," he said, "traversing the narrow valleys and the mountains, mingling with the people, chatting with each, and subordinating the interest I felt in a beautiful and romantic country in the interest of a higher order which is attached to the social condition of the people. This contemplation was less pleasant; because, although I was in the County nearest to Dublin, in an ornate country, filled

175

with 'villas' and residences of large owners; though County Wicklow mines employ around this place of nearly two thousand people, I had very little reason to be satisfied with the condition of the people.

The rents in County Wicklow are almost everywhere greater than the land can provide for, and the small farmers have as much difficulty as their day laborers in earning enough of food so as not to starve. Among Protestants as among Catholics, the high rent for land was a subject of universal complaint, and the one as well as the other community lived in a most miserable condition. When we asked them why they had committed themselves to pay a rent that they knew was too high, they all answered equally: how could they have lived otherwise? what could they have done? Indeed, in Ireland, the competition for land is nothing other than the mad auction of people reduced to their limits.

As for the condition of the day laborers, it did not correspond much with what some of my friends in Dublin had told me; who should have known Wicklow, however. They had assured me that all the day laborers found work, and that their lives were quite happy. I took the road to the hills once, after-dinner, to judge for myself. A short walk brought me into a narrow valley, in which were several huts strewn around. I visited three of these. The first one I entered was constructed of sod, and only contained a single room. We were not sheltered from the wind nor the rain, and the ground was very wet. For furniture, all I found there was a small bed very thinly covered, a wooden bench and an iron pot. There was no fireplace nor chimney vent; but on the ground we saw some debris of thorny broom (*ulex europoeus*) that had been burned there. The occupant paid two pounds of rent for this most miserable dwelling, to which was not attached a single inch of surrounding soil. The second in which I entered was built

on the slope of a hill. Its construction was in all respects similar to that of the preceding one. There I found a woman with her four children; their furniture

176

consisted of two small wooden beds without upholstery, a step stool, a small bench and a pot. Here too we saw burned broom, the only fuel that the poor in this county can afford. The children were in rags, and their mother grieved for not being able to send them to school. The father was a day laborer, hired at six pence per day; but he paid eighty of those working days for the rent of his cabin; so that this left him only four and a half pence per day to maintain his wife and four children, with potatoes which cost him four pence the measure (stone) for 14 lbs. It should be noted that Mr. Inglis makes absolutely no account in all of Ireland of women and children who are working; because indeed in a country where half of the men are unemployed, it would be even more impossible for weaker beings to find any work that was remunerated.

“Then I entered a third cabin, even more miserable than the other two. We were neither sheltered from the wind nor rain; there was no wooden bed, and absolutely no furniture except for a step stool and an iron pot. We saw no sign that there had been a fire. In these miserable surroundings there was a decently dressed woman with five children. Her husband also worked as a day laborer at six pence a day. This family had had a pig, but it had been seized few days previously to pay the rent. These poor people had expected to be able to pay by selling their pig when it would be fattened, and they had spent their sixpence a day to maintain themselves; but the high price of potatoes had forced them to stop, before the pig was large enough to be sold at a profit. Maybe the one who had seized it could not be blamed either. He was a small farmer from the mountains, who paid twenty shillings per acre of tenancy, and who had as much difficulty in living and paying for his expenses as the poor day laborer who depended on him.” (Volume I, ch. 2, p. 27-32.)

It is in this way that Mr. Inglis, in all his “Voyage”,

177

studies the population; it is thus that from place to place, he enters the laborers' cabins, describes their furnishings, ensures the amount of their daily wages and their food. County Wexford, where he was located then, is one of the most prosperous in the south of Ireland; the many rich people and beautiful country homes there are considerable, the land is fertile, agriculture much perfected, and the products of the land being most abundant. The three cabins, the description of which we have just copied, however, give a fair and in no way exaggerated idea of the way the average farm population lives, not only in Wexford County, but all over Ireland. There are, true enough, some exceptions, in the places of favored neighborhoods in an opulent city, or better yet by the moderation of a rich and generous owner, who has made it a rule to maintain the tenancy of its

land at the old price, and to refuse more advantageous offers which are made to him. In these districts the cabins of the day laborers are a little better; sometimes they are divided into two rooms; there is some furniture, a little earthenware, and the day laborers are sometimes able to add some other food to their boiled potatoes. So, for example, the barony of Forth is a celebrated district in all of southern Ireland, being inhabited by a race of Welshmen of origin, who do enjoy more of the niceties in life; who are industrious, careful, peaceful, clean and sober, and priding themselves in keeping appearances of order and ease.

"I left," said Mr. Inglis, "Wexford early in a country chariot, to see with my own eyes all the uniquenesses that had been announced to me. I found a country that was in no way remarkable for its natural beauty, but that was everywhere cultivated with intelligence, and whose inhabitants appeared, comparatively, to be at their ease. Farms and thatched cottages, because I would not call these cabins, were large in number, and with few exceptions, the former indicated an ease, and the latter a cleanliness to say the least.

178

I visited a large number of both; because coins will always find and indeed are always finding, as in all over Ireland, a warm welcome. I left my chariot, I crossed the fields, and I lifted the fence latch without hesitation. The further I went through this district, the more I was struck in effect of its characteristic features. Not only was the interior of the houses more comfortable, a few flowerpots, some small gardens, announced that the poor had a sense of adorning his home; agriculture was worthy of praise, the plowing seemed good, the land clear, the wheat crops and beans, of which a large quantity is cultivated here, were most beautiful, and a two-horse plow was driven with skill and the least of labor by one man. But one should not believe, from what I have just said, that the inhabitants of this barony move along in abundance, or that their way of life is entirely different from that of the rest of the island. If they are indeed superior in cleanliness, in order, and apparent ease, it is the result of a difference in character rather than in position. Tradition has made them attach their pride in neatness and decorum, and while the children may sometimes find themselves worse off than their fathers, they do not forget these feelings. On the other hand, industry and providence put farmers in a position to improve their agriculture, and to employ perhaps a little more capital when the opportunity arose. As a result they offered day laborers more work and more regularly, so that there are few who find no employment; but their wages are not any higher than elsewhere, and consequently their way of living can not be much different. However, the potato does not form their only food, they make a fairly large use of barley bread, and among women tea is a most universally used luxury item.

The most common extent of farms in this barony is 30 to 40 acres, their rent is two pounds fifty shillings per acre, and at the present price of commodities that's all a farmer needs to take in to live and pay his rent. I entered the house of a farmer who was leasing a

forty acre farm, as he was about to sit down to dinner to have dinner with his family. This dinner consisted of potatoes, buttermilk, partially skimmed milk, barley bread and butter. The land had been in the family of this farmer since four generations. His great-grandfather paid six shillings per acre, his grandfather ten, his father twenty, and he forty. By means of good work and that of his son, he could live, he said, as we see he was doing, paying his rent, and save something for his daughters.”

(volume I, chap. 2, p. 46-49)

The picture of this modest prosperity grips the heart as much as that of misery, for one feels that it is going to end; when these good people, who have barely enough to live on, will need to renew their leases, and it will be increased on them, as it has been increased on them from generation to generation, as they are constantly being increased throughout Ireland (volume II, ch. 8, p. 140); and they will have to give up successively their butter, barley bread, buttermilk, partially skimmed milk, and with that the appearance of cleanliness and decency which was in their view even more precious than more substantial food.

A rent, as we will call it, according to English usage, a rent of two pounds per acre, although much higher than the average value of land in England, is much lower than the rent which landlords often wrest from their Irish farmers, although the produce of this last country, almost all intended for export, yields much less to the farmer. "While at Waterford," said Mr. Inglis, "I made frequent excursions throughout the surrounding country, and I made sure the rent of the smallest estates was excessive. I found small farms rented at 4 pounds. 10 s., 5 p. and even 7 pounds per acre. In all, the potato was the only farmer's food. He only sometimes added offal from salting pigs. There is indeed in Waterford a place called Arundel-Square, where the bones of the thorn and other parts of the pig that are not worth the expense of exports sell for a penny and a half or

two pence a pound, and on Saturday night this place is all filled with greedy buyers. There is no possibility for farmers to live while paying such high rents. Several of them agreed with me that they could never pay their arrears, and that they had agreed to such conditions only because they were pressed by hunger. Such is the universal consequence of leasing land by auction. Men who know no other industry than agriculture, and with so many unemployed, will promise anything that is being asked of them to find a way to set themselves up" (volume I, ch. 3, p. 64).

"The farmers that are hunted from home that becomes rented to the latest bidder have no means of legal resistance against an act of greed which reduces him, with their families, to begging or death. But can we be surprised that they often threaten to burn the house or the crops of the one who will replace them?" "A man" said Mr. Inglis, "showed me a threatening letter that he had just received. It had come from Waterford to let a farm, on some land he owned near New-Ross, and for which he had

paid: 3 pounds 5 sh. per acre, at a higher price; but since the threat made to him, he could no longer find a farmer (volume I, p. 59). Almost all the outrages and murders that defile Ireland, (he says later ch. 4, p. 117), arise from one of these two causes, either competition for land, or collection of taxes and tithes.

“Before leaving Waterford, I visited some of the worst parts of this city, and I found the most frightful misery. Under half-open huts there lived up till three or four families, each of them lying on straw, in a corner of it; near them there was no furniture of any kind nor utensils. These buildings were surrounded by mire and garbage, inside and out. The heads of these families were absent; they made rounds in the fields to beg for potatoes.” (Volume I, ch. 3, p. 67)

We must not forget that this appalling misery is taking place, not in a land disgraced by nature,

181

but on the contrary having a most fertile soil, in the climate that much favors vegetation; in a country where frosts, long droughts, floods and hail, are almost unknown calamities; where crops for export hardly ever go to waste; while at the same time these fields, which neither the day laborer nor the farmer will ever taste the products of, are subjected to a most sophisticated type of agriculture, and that the traveler who passed through them but living in England, by comparison found nothing to reproach them with. It must be remembered that beside these habitations of the most degrading misery also rise the castles of the high aristocracy. Mr. Inglis visits everything near the magnificent domain of the Marquess of Waterford, whose estate, four thousand six hundred acres of expanse, is the most beautiful and the largest to be found in all three realms. Lord Besborough’s estate, which is also near Waterford, is no less remarkable for its magnificence. All around are strewn a large number of the manors of gentlemen, and in their galleries of paintings have gathered the works of the greatest masters of the arts. Finally, close by is also the manufacture of cotton fabrics from Mayfield, which rich Quakers, Messrs. Malcomson, established, despite stubborn opposition from the Marquess of Waterford and all the Beresfords. It meets the competition of Manchester, even in the English markets, successfully, and it distributes wages to nearly nine hundred workers. It is therefore not the lack of wealth, neither knowledge, nor industry, nor the example, nor the encouragement that can be given to the large landowners, nor the highest civilization anywhere and the protection of laws. The traveler who only looks at things from all sides is struck with admiration; he who deals with the fate of man experiences in turn either indignation or the most sorrowful pity.

Thomasown, in the County of Kilkenny, is where Mr. Inglis alludes to this contrast. When speaking of the pleasures experienced in admiring some exquisitely finished cabinets in the vicinity, he said: “It is impossible that disturbing painful sentiments do not associate themselves with the pure enjoyment of the most beautiful

domains in Ireland. All that a heart can desire is to be found concentrated within the castle walls, sometimes even the adjoining village may owe due to the charity of an owner's benevolence the appearance of some ease; but in the beyond, all comfort disappears. The opulence and humanity of any individual can only extend their influence to a well limited distance, and beyond this circle we only find rags and begging. This thought struck me here, where I was surrounded by residences of several wealthy owners, and where everyone would agree that praising the benevolence of the bulk of them is in order; and yet the condition of the people was generally deplorable. In my walks I met women and mothers begging in the open countryside, and who returned to their cabin with a few potatoes in their bag, a few small scraps collected along the paths, under their arms. And they were not ordinary beggars, you might see anywhere, but, as I later ascertained, the wives and daughters of the day laborers who in no way could find a job. Several had not been able to obtain enough to seed their little plots of potatoes. Misery in the cabins was extreme; in several we did not see a pig. I was starting to understand the country better. At first it shocked me when I saw the snout of a pig at the door of a cabin. The inhabitants must have been very miserable, it seemed to me, if they only had a common space to share with a pig; but now I was glad to see it, and I reserved my pity for those who had no pig. Without doubt, it would have been better if it had its own little sty; but yet, separated or not, I enjoyed seeing the one who, an Irish peasant once told me, 'has the most rights in the house, because he will pay the rent'; enter or leave by using the door of the cabin, or to hear him growl in his interior domain. I am living nearby Thomastown, an example of the highest prosperity that a poor family could achieve here; three pigs lived with them in their cottage. We must add that at the time that I was making these observations, work was

particularly sought after, because it was potato planting season" (Volume I, ch. 4, p. 79).

Mr. Inglis bluntly denounces the lords which, by their exactions, aggravate the misery of the people. One of those being Lord Clifden, owner of the town of Callen and the surrounding area in County Kilkenny. This lord, who has a revenue of ten to twelve thousand pounds sterling, not only is subjecting all the inhabitants to the most appalling dismissals, by the rigor with which he demands excessive rents of them, and never relieves any, but on top of their misery he yet levies taxes too. At the gates of Callen he charges a sales tax on all objects necessary for life, potatoes, coal, butter, milk, from which he earns around £ 250; the inhabitants number around four or five thousand, out of which there are about a thousand who are occasionally unemployed, six or seven hundred being absolutely destitute, and two hundred beggars whose infirmities make them incapable of any work. It seems that the pretext for this tax was the maintenance of the roads; but never a shilling has been spent in that regard, and they are in

such an appalling state, that twelve minutes extra are charged by couriers to cross the town. In the neighborhoods of the people, the cabins or rather the dens of the inhabitants are holes dug in the earth, with a little straw, and one cannot distinguish any trace of comfort or civilization.” (Volume I, ch. 4, p. 99.)

What we should especially notice in Ireland, is to which extent the destiny of the entire poor class depends on the rich class. In this country, in fact, no gradual decline from the richest to the poorest, which establishes a link between all conditions can be seen; there is no middle class between those who have everything and those who have nothing; one does not see ease without opulence. Also, only one owner must consume on his own all the products of agriculture, superior to the coarse food of the poor

184

that are not exported. His house is the only market for all small foodstuffs, cream, fresh butter, eggs, vegetables, fruits; so also anything that is not susceptible to export ceases to be demanded from the land. A lord is still the only one who asks and who pays for any kind of work, that I is not intended for an immediately increase in agricultural products. It is he alone who can undertake any work in the public interest, think of the future, and deal with improvements. Throughout the rest of Europe, the ease or the misery of the plowman, the industrialist, the day laborer, depend essentially on anyone’s own prudence or misconduct. When he is working, is thrifty, and is virtuous, he has no need of anyone else to find his way in life. But in Ireland, and to a certain extent in some parts of England too, the rich, by concentrating all property solely in their own hands, at the same time, took on all the responsibility for the destiny of the poor. And this concerns not only the vices of the rich man, responsible for so many lives and so much happiness, it is all his whims, all his mistakes, the failures he experiences in his fortune, his childishness, his illnesses, and especially his absence; which can reduce a region to begging before it has as chance to thrive.

The Irish love refulgence, they want to shine, they want enjoyments; the lords generally have a taste for lavishness and of magnificence that often is disproportionate to their fortune. It is in Connaught, the westernmost and least civilized part of the island, where the national character is more exposed; there the owners are almost all overweight. “I had opportunity,” says Mr. Inglis, “to converse, in Galway, with several landowners, and I was sorry to see how many of them felt little sympathy for the condition of the poor, how much also they rejected with terror the idea of a law in their favor. The reason that should explain it, as well as the oppressive conduct of landlords throughout the West of Ireland, is their own recklessness. The businesses of most of them are in distress, and their own embarrassments force them to be hard on their tenants, who are striving for the highest revenue that can be offered to them. So each class, living off the earth, feels an equal need; the farmer for not having a shilling remaining after having paid his rent, and the Lord after having appeased his creditors.

Any incentive to advance becomes impossible, and work isn't required any longer; the plowman won't find any, and excessively land rents stop farming; the day laborer agrees to work fourteen hour days for six, or even only five pence; at a time when this daily wage would hardly be enough for him to buy a stone (14 lb.) of potatoes." (Volume II, ch. 2, p. 24)

But the position of the poor inhabitants becomes more cruel yet again when the rich man goes broke, creditors seize his property, and have it administered on their behalf. For the agent has no choice, and cannot use mercy, he must cover the expenses the rich man made on credit; he seizes the pending crops, he kidnaps cattle in the stables, he does not calculate the disproportion of his actions between the money he recovers and the far worse consequences for the chain of men who live off the land, farmers, sub-farmers, day laborers, all become victims of the owner. (Volume II, ch. 3, p. 39.)

The new school of political economy, which seems to have proposed to prove that everything is compensated for in human society, that everything naturally returns to its level, that charity is without merit, luxury without danger, dissipation without inconvenience, also wanted to demonstrate, by abstractions, that the disposition of the rich to eat their revenues, far from the districts which produced it, or what is called in Ireland 'absenteeism', is without inconvenience for the country from which these revenues are derived. This school does not consider facts as a whole, and as observation presents them, but yet claims to analyze them. And for that it isolates in imagination some causes, of which consequences are deduced; and then equations are drawn that in practice never check out. It is necessary too moreover, to make a strange abuse of this creation of an imaginary world, and explain harsh violence away with the simplest of reasoning, to come to the conclusion that a producer has no problem when his

consumer leaves him, while he himself goes a few hundred leagues away consuming the products of another producer. It is necessary, among other things, to forget the whole class of products that can only be consumed in the same place where produced, and which cease production as soon as the rich leave. And we must forget still, all the acts of benevolence, and only consider calculation as the sole motive for human actions. Our traveler however destroys this theory even better with facts. "Mitchelstown and its surroundings have suffered cruelly," he said, "from the failures recently experienced by the family of the Earl of Kingston. It stopped there to spend forty thousand pounds sterling per year of revenue. No example, in Ireland, puts more immediately before my eyes the loss experienced by a county in which its rich owners cease to live. All lower classes also suffer, both in the city and in its vicinity. While I was staying there, the distress in Mitchelstown was so great that several hundred individuals perished of hunger; a county assembly began an investigation and at the same time opened a subscription...."

Will we believe that in a city of five thousand inhabitants, we found one thousand eight hundred people without food? Among these were one thousand two hundred unemployed day laborers and their families; the other six hundred were old people, the infirm, widows and children. In addition to these eighteen hundred people, we found one thousand two hundred more in the same parish, but outside the city, who also were destitute.” (Volume I, ch. 6, p. 142)

“We talked about the plight of the farmers in Ireland; it is also necessary to make known that of the inhabitants of cities. Take for example the city of Limerick, one of the most extensive, the most commercial, and the fastest growing and important cities in Ireland. It is true that much of the land on which this city is built, including its surroundings, belongs to the Earl of Limerick; a man about whom Mr. Inglis only allows himself to say one thing; which is that whether he questioned the big or the small, the rich or

the poor, he never heard a word to the good of his lordship. (Volume I, ch. 13, p. 311)

“I was told that I would find more misery in Limerick, than in any of the cities I had previously visited. I continued my investigations with all the care of which I am capable, and I am forced to say that they confirmed the most sinister reports that had been made to me. I spent a day visiting the neighborhoods of the city where I had to find the most destitution and misery. I entered more than forty of these abodes of poverty, and up to the last hour of my life I will not be able to forget the scenes of total abandonment and hopeless suffering that presented itself to me that day. Some of these retreats were attics, others cellars, others huts resting on bare earth, in courtyards or narrow alleys. I do not wish to talk about their dirt, but it couldn't be surpassed in places intended solely to be a garbage dump; let us imagine all that can be disgusting there, and we will not go beyond the truth. In three quarters of those miserable dwellings where I entered, there was no furniture or utensils of any kind, except for an iron pot: no table, no chairs, no benches, no wooden bed, but two, three, or four small bundles of straw, sometimes with one or two old and torn mats rolled up in a corner, unless these were already occupied as a bed. Among the adult inhabitants, some were old, hunched over, or overwhelmed by disease, others were young, but hairless and thin, and surrounded by starving children; there were some sitting on the damp earth, others standing, and still others who could not get up from their heap of straw. Hardly in any of these dwellings did I even see a single potato. In one I noticed a small opening that led to a room below. I made a torch out of a piece of paper, to see what it contained. It was a cellar completely dark, and about twelve feet square; at both corners were two heaps of straw; on one sat a woman who could not get up, on the other were lying two absolutely naked children, and a rag thrown over them served them as common coverage.

But I saw something yet worse; in an almost dark cellar, on the damp ground from which I felt my feet slip, I found a man sitting on a little sawdust; he was naked, he did not have even a shirt, but he had wrapped a torn doormat covered in trash around his body. His thinness had all the appearance of a skeleton, with the bones seemingly sticking out from his body; he was starving. Instead of forty dwellings, I could have visited hundreds of them; instead of a few hundred men, women, children, in this state of abandonment and despair. I could have visited thousands of them. I randomly entered passageways, cabins, and attics, and I have no reason to believe that the forty dwellings I visited were more miserable than the many hundreds of others, behind the doors of which I passed.”

“I also saw another kind of misery. The individuals whom I spoke of were old, infirm, or sick; but I saw another class of beings who still had the strength and the will to earn their living; however, they were advancing rapidly to the same state of sickness and helplessness noted before.

They were weavers who had been working from five in the morning until eight in the evening, and who only earned two and a half to four shillings per week. Many of them had wives and children; their food was reduced to one meal of boiled potatoes, per day. I don’t need to explain how locked up in polluted air, relentless work, insufficient food and despair quickly reduced them to the same state of exhaustion and inability to work, as I had seen of others.” (Volume I, ch. 13, p. 302-305.)

The author takes the opportunity of this appalling picture to insist on justice, on the necessity of some legal provision in favor of the poor; on the obligation imposed on all governments not to allow its subjects to die of hunger under the deteriorating protection of the established order, not

to allow the burden of public charity to rest on the shoulders of a few generous people with limited means, while men with colossal fortunes, men who often by their greed have caused the appalling misery of these human creatures in the first place; like Lord Limerick, for example, almost absolutely evading all responsibility.”

We will go further than him however, and say that in Ireland the social order is bad in essence, and that it will need to be fundamentally changed in scope. We’ll say it’s not just about giving bread or charity to the hungry poor; but to ensure the existence, the property of every man whose only wealth is his power to work, and to make this wealth sufficient for him to exist decently.

We will say that in the original social contract which instituted property, and which endowed it with guarantees; this right of a few to proclaimed advantages in life has not been recognized by all, and was protected by the public force only because it was considered to be the best way to increase the opulence or the ease of all, and consequently to ensure, even to the poorest, the necessities of life. But this social contract is a bilateral one. If it ensures the wealthy a peaceful enjoyment from its affluence and luxury,

it is under the express condition that the poor who, by their work, create all wealth, will obtain a full remuneration for this work.

This remuneration must include not only what is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of life, but in addition provides advantages which makes, even for the poorest, a social life preferable to that of the savage. Thus the poor acquires by his work, and by his respect for the property of others, the rights to decent housing, clean clothing, and health; to an abundant, and fairly varied food supply to maintain strength and health. Moreover, he has the right to some of the enjoyments in life, some pleasures attached to the satisfaction of his needs, some security for the present, some hope for the future, some relaxation in work, and some rest given to the body; so that intelligence and sensitivity can be exercised in leisure. It was only after all these things were

190

assured to the poor due to the fruits of their labor, that the rights of the rich could start to come into play. It is only the surplus, after the basic needs for the lives of all have been taken care of, that forms the revenue to be directed to opulence.

There has instead however been a factual spoliation, there has been a theft committed by the rich from the poor, when the rich perceive that from fertile and skillfully cultivated land a revenue becomes extracted that makes him swim in opulence, while the farmer who engendered this revenue, who bathed in his sweats all the products of which it consists, starves without being able to touch it.

We will not continue to follow Mr. Inglis step by step in the rest of his circuit through Ireland. We will only say briefly, that the only districts where the condition of the farmer appeared to him to be relatively happy, are the most mountainous, the wildest, the most infertile, those where civilization and capital did penetrate the least, and where competition has increased rents the least (volume II, ch. 3, p. 41; ch. 4, p. 61); in others, on the contrary, where cultivation had made rapid progress, where the most recent kind had just been introduced – whatever improvement one might think became apparent in the condition of things, there certainly wasn't any in the condition of men, because all output surpluses had been added to the rent (volume II, ch. 7, p. 120). Finally in the Protestant province of Ulster, where a population of Scottish immigrants, thrifty and industrious, brought some cities to a high degree of prosperity; the subsistence, the real property of the poor has no guarantee. We have seen, on the contrary, the condition of the ploughmen worsen rapidly in the course of the last fifteen years, and if no remedy is provided, in a few years the same cause of misery will lead to the condition of the farmers of the north of Ireland to become as deplorable as those of the farmers in the south." (volume II, ch. 12, p. 220).

What is the remedy? it is the question that it is impossible not to repeat with a cry of pain and fear, almost on every page of Mr. Inglis' book. What is this remedy? This is the question that we propose to examine in another

Essay. because there is no man, whether as some stranger in Ireland, or in the whole British Empire; who wouldn't ardently

191

wish to rescue millions of human creatures from misery, suffering, and degradation, which shame civilization and Christianity. Besides the contagion spreads every day, by the waves of Irish emigres who were brought to the coast of Scotland by need and to England; it is already reaching Great Britain, and soon it would corrupt the whole continent, because the causes which have had such a fatal influence on Ireland have already began acting on us.

Without doubt it is right and appropriate to think of a legal provision for the poor, and that public contributions from society are needed to pull them out of distress. It is socially convenient to take care of hospitals, clinics, and orphanages; it is convenient to set up savings banks and other lending facilities; it is advisable to found schools, to support worship by providing stipends to a clergy and to put the aid of religion within reach of all. But all these efforts of charity are just palliatives, when the evil goes so deep and is also universal. What could schools be used for, for those who have no leisure time available to them; instruction, for those who beg in vain for some relief of the most strenuous bodily labor; savings banks, for those who far from saving do not have enough potatoes to appease their hunger; pawnshops, for those who, far from being able to pledge jewels, do not even have a bench to sit on, a wooden bowl to eat their soup, a piece of cloth to cover their nudity? No, it is much deeper in the organization of society that must be dug. It is the fundamental relationship between the rich and the laborer that must be reached and reexamined. For this is the hugely important contract on which essentially human society as a whole rests. The contract between the owner and the cultivator, which must be brought back to its foundational significance, so that those who, through their work, make the whole nation viable, not be deprived of their own right to life. For may the peasant be happy and assured of his proper existence in the country; so that its condition, in our progressively oriented civilization, is not infinitely worse than it was in the most maligned times of feudalism.

192

SIXTH ESSAY

Condition of Cultivators in Tuscany.

To know the condition of the cultivators, and how they are affected by the progress of territorial wealth, We took it as our duty not to simply stick to reasoning, not to just conclude from principles to consequences,

but to, on the contrary, study empirical facts, to examine the nations most advanced in civilization and wealth, ask to their best observers, to those who are the least influenced by the spirit of the system, what is really the state of their peasants at home, and from this state then getting to the probable causes as to why it had to come about. We would like to have encountered a greater number of works such as that of Mr. Inglis; we would like to have been able to collect such scrupulously true and detailed tableaux on the life of the industrious, in the various administrative systems of both urban and rural economies, and in the various countries of Europe. Indeed we are not lacking, for all the countries which have some social importance, tables of economic data; we do not lack details that represent the value of imports and exports, for each country, and even by city. We are not lacking in reports on the activity of commerce, nor of manufactures. As for another kind of research, we do not lack books and newspapers that interpret for us, from country to country, the lives of the people of the world, and the pleasures or vices of opulence. But the most important among the national traits

193

are never found in there; in almost none of these publications do we get shown the domestic life of the common people. We are never given the inventory of their small fortune; nor were we introduced to their usual food, their enjoyments and their labors.

However, from the same chrematistic perspective alone, there is perhaps nothing more important to know than the domestic life of the masses; because it is this which determines the national consumption.

The numerical proportion of the rich as when compared to the poor, that between the various conditions, and the annual consumption of each condition, should be among the first data to be gathered statistically; because these are the ones that most immediately affect the reproduction of wealth.

The picture presented of the Irish population, leaves a cruel suffering and an ardent desire to remediation in the soul; but this remedy would be much easier to disentangle if we were enlightened by a greater number of such comparisons, and if we could consult the practical experience of several other peoples. We have studied on a number of occasions, by our own eyes and in various countries, the state of the local peasants; but we feel that observations made while traveling are not sufficient to really penetrate the inner condition of the families of the poor. It takes a long stay with them, a daily contact and even a discussion of intersecting interests, to study them in depth.

So from the perspective of a traveler we did not think we could complete the picture, of which the need was felt, for the condition of the Tuscan peasant; or rather, for that of the peasant of the valley of Nievole. But it so happens that in this province we have a very small inheritance; which is putting us in the position to intimately get to know the peasants there. Better in fact than possessions somewhat larger than we also have in the Savoie and in Switzerland. Because in Tuscany, we are directly associated

with a peasant who has no interest in hiding anything from us; while the farmer and the laborer, in Switzerland and in the Savoy, see in the owner an adversary with whom they believe they have to delicately weigh their

194

words in any conversation. We also have another reason to draw a sketch here of the condition of the Tuscan peasants; it is that we were deeply struck by the relationship between them and the Irish. So that we feel at the same time, and in the sweet hope that the happiness enjoyed by Tuscan peasants could be brought within reach of the Irish; and the terror, on the contrary, that in the name of the progress of science, in accordance with the great principles of political economy, regarding the increase of the net product, one does not reduce the Tuscans to the state of Irish; for, at this moment, there is something shaken and uncertain in the economic system of Tuscany, as there is in all Europe.

The extraordinary encouragement given to production, during thirty years of the Napoleonic wars, upset the necessary balance between consumption and production, and threatened all markets with congestion.

All the owners are hurting everywhere; each is especially dissatisfied with the system being practiced, and to which their losses are attributed.

Particularly in Tuscany, there are men endowed with as much patriotism as enlightenment, who are striving to introduce more sophisticated methods into agriculture, but they also talk about reforming the contract that binds them to the farmer; while in our eyes even some slight modifications to the system, as it is followed today, would suffice to deprive the Tuscan peasant of all the guarantees which custom has given him, while at the same time causing him to lose all the pleasures, the taste of happiness, of an existence which makes this country charming.

The Tuscans, like the Irish, are endowed with a lively imagination, a quick and brilliant mind, which often expressively comes to the fore in the wit of the common man. In both countries, people are remarkably good looking. One cannot stroll on the markets of Tuscany or Ireland without sighting a large number of men or women that a sculptor or a painter would eagerly take as models. The inhabitants of these two countries combine a great open-mindedness with a great kindness of heart, an eagerness to oblige and to make oneself pleasant, a respectful welcome

195

that at the same time is caressing, a generosity, which especially on the part of the poor is most admirable, to share one's meager necessities with those who are suffering more, or who are more miserable than oneself, and an equally great liberality in supporting their Church. The two peoples are both strongly attached to the Catholic faith; but while the Church is still very rich in Tuscany, in Ireland it was stripped of all its belongings. The voluntary contributions raised by the clergy are however hardly any less abundant in one of these two countries than in the other. Because the clergy of Tuscany are infinitely more numerous as well as including some

mendicant orders, they recoup, in addition to their occasional services and the masses, very considerable sums from the revenue of the faithful for the decoration of churches and the splendor of their festivals. In both countries it could perhaps be observed to have put the clergy in a sham position, when it was obliged to solicit the pecuniary aid of the faithful in this way, and thereby diminish the moral influence which religion should exercise. In both countries, indeed, great crimes are committed by men who haven't abjured all religious sentiment; homicide especially is not rare there, and each national, finding in himself a formidable disposition to passionate outbursts, is so indulgent to the anger of others that the murderer excites less horror than pity.

There are many other connections between Tuscany and Ireland, and a superficial observer might believe both countries repressed to the same condition. Not only, indeed, the population is very considerable in both, but it abounds. The commercial and manufacturing industry opens its workshops to it only in a few districts; while, in others, no work at all is offered, except that of the fields. In both countries we affirm, that the workers of the cities never think of the next day, and that they regularly spend, on Sundays, everything they earned in the week. No legal provision is insured to counter extreme poverty, no more in Tuscany than in Ireland: also the places are covered with beggars in rags that beg for alms ensuring that they suffer from hunger. However, hospitals are open liberally, in Tuscany, to the accidental miseries of humanity, to the sick, to foundlings, to fools, and their number is not increasing.

If there is an essential difference between the two country it is this: misery constantly hunts any man dedicated to work in Ireland; in Tuscany, only

196

the misery of the city dweller is real; the one of the countryside enjoys on the contrary, at least generally so, all the contentment, all the security, and all the interest in life, which a proportionally and constantly rewarded job can assure to the working poor. It is a model worthy of study, it is a sweet depiction of variety, abundance and peace, on which it is a pleasure to rest one's eyes.

There are three classes of cultivators in Tuscany, who are known as: 'affittuari', 'livellari', and 'mezzaiuoli'. The 'affittuari' are the farmers who, as in France, in England, and all other countries, have a lease at term for a limited number of years, during which they are absolute masters of their cultivation, in return for a fixed rent that they pay to the owner; at the renewal of their lease, they are called to battle the landlord, for him not to increase the annual rent or to reduce it. These periodic battles, in which the farmer pretends to no longer to have more than a temporary and short interest in the land, or even desires that there be no recognition of signs of prosperity that would authorize an increase in his rent, have caused the lease of any system of agriculture based on the product of trees and shrubs to be extended almost automatically. All land planted with olive trees and vines would undoubtedly be ruined by the farmer otherwise. Tuscany is a country of hills, essentially peculiar to olive trees, mulberries and vines;

and in all the hills where the agricultural industry has been successful, one does not see farmers or 'affittuari'. These are found in the rich plains of the valley of Nievole, and especially of Pistoiais. Although those hills are planted with mulberry trees and

197

vines, because in these humid lands the product of trees, abundant in quantity, inferior in quality, matter much less to the owner and the farmer than those of the cereals. It is also found in all the depopulated parts of Tuscany's plains; the farmer expecting above all his profit to derive from the savings he can make on human labor, either by improvements of plowing implements, or by the abandonment of any sort of agricultural industry that requires meticulous care and attention. The farm lease, in Tuscany as elsewhere, isn't escaping cultural developments either. It drives out small cultivators from the land, and at the same time strips it off trees and shrubs which make the countryside appear rich and ornamental. The farm lease, in the regions of Tuscany where it is common, also created a fourth class of cultivators unknown in all the others, the 'pigionali', the day laborers who live in a rented, thatched cottage (pigione). These have no land attached to them. They put themselves at the service of the farmer in times of pressing needs, and live on plunder during the rest of the year; often forcing the farmer to defend his crops, fruits, and the leaves of its mulberry trees with rifles. Misery, precarious existence, immorality, and hostility to the social order, which we reported on in the 'cottagers' of the British Empire, all find their counterpart among the 'pigionali' of Tuscany, and for the same reasons.

The second class of Tuscan cultivators is that of 'Livellari', or owners burdened with a perpetual annuity. The 'Livello', the emphyteutic lease, at first glance only seems to be a modification of the farm lease; but it differs essentially by its character of perpetuity. It transfers, from the original master of the soil to its cultivator. All property guarantees and pleasures thereof, all the master's love, all the zeal which assures society that the landowner will in no way slack off point in his efforts to extract from the earth what he can. It was the Grand Duke Pierre Léopold who notably increased the number of 'livellari', thereby obliging the Church to give up control of almost all of its property, subject to a condition however. It guaranteed, in fact, to the pious corporations, an invariable annuity.

198

And it was the appropriate thing to ask of them too; for they returned all the properties that had been held in 'dead hands', that is to say without the eye and the affection of a master owner, without which the appropriation of land ceases to be an advantage for society.

The simultaneity with which this measure was applied to a very large area of land was also the cause of the only drawback that we could blame them for. The emphyteutic lease must create farmers or peasant owners, this is its goal and its consequent utility. All the peasants who themselves took

care of the 'livelli', proportionate to the work that their family would be able to accomplish, to the yields it could consume, are prosperous and happy. These peasants directly exchange their sweats with the soil; they sow and they harvest for themselves: it is only the surplus of their produce that they take to the markets to pay their perpetual rent. Many years of agricultural prosperity, during which time their products started selling at triple and quadruple their original prices, enabled them to capitalize on their work. That is to say, to continue further clearing and thus change the plots of land, which had fallen to them by sharing, into cultivated fields; and thus increasing their total value, but still subject to a perpetual annuity which had been estimated as equal to its full rent, now often is selling for more than half as much than what raw land would be worth. But since bad times have arrived, foodstuffs have fallen disproportionately in price, the 'livellari' are no doubt suffering too, because they need to sell a lot more of their harvests to pay their rent; but this annuity is still paid, so that pious corporations have lost nothing. But these farmers would never think of giving up their 'livello', it never got them caught in the grips of misery and sufferings like the Irish; by working they remained independent and survived.

Unfortunately, others than the peasants also took possession of 'livelli'. The rapid earlier increase in the value of commodities made speculation appear advantageous; capitalists eagerly seized the opportunity to acquire an expanse of land much higher than the value of the capital they had. Whoever acquires a 'livello' pays only to the owner of the 'laudemio', and as a guarantee of the title entrusted to him, 15 percent of its value, or five times the normal

annuity, the annual canon. There is undoubtedly a great advantage to make peasants owners, without forcing them to undo themselves of all their small savings for that, without diverting from the cultivation of the land the capital with which they must develop it. On the contrary, in countries where a large mass of domestically produced goods is put on the market for sale, the value at which these capital funds become acquired have to be subtracted from all agricultural revenue. In fact, the capital that farmers, owners, or speculators, have withdrawn in order to make their purchases from some useful enterprise, passes to the government which dispels them for war expenses or the lavishness of its own administration. So when in Tuscany the cheap land offered as 'livello', got capitalists interested in entering this speculation intended for peasants, these capitalists gave no thought to observing any proportion between the extent of land they took charge of, and the strength of their family to cultivate it, or the number of mouths it consisted of to eat its fruits. The more land they could get a hold of, the more work they could devote to this land, the more it would yield to them, and the happier they were. As long as the commodities drew a high price, their speculation succeeded. They took day laborers or servants to cultivate their 'livelli'; they brought to the market the most food they could, and the with their product-obtained money not only paid for their

annual cannon, but also all for all their cultivating expenditures. They made their entire industry dependent on commerce, but, as they worked with all their might to saturate the markets, their consumption did in no way increase with their production, they soon found themselves in arrears for the payment of their cannon; and embarrassed, both for having to come up with the annual advances to cultivate, and their station in life being so close to that of a gentleman farmer.

The non-peasant 'livellari' are in fact subservient owners,

200

who will suffer cruelly from a drop in the price of foodstuffs; and who do not live off their soil, but from sales of products of the soil. And they will continue to do so until their final ruinous expenses, which they don't know how to reduce when their revenues decrease.

Many of these 'livellari', or speculators, or gentleman farmers, gave their own land for cultivation to 'Mezzaiuoli'. This is the third class of Tuscan cultivators, and it's the one on which we especially want to focus attention because the contract which constitutes the 'mezzaiuolo' or sharecropper is becoming so common, that any other type of contract is rapidly considered as an exception in the country. The owner entrusts the sharecropper with a house and a smallholding already in a profitable state, with the livestock and agricultural capital needed to make them worthy as such. In those districts where agriculture is the most intensive, especially in the Nievole valley, this smallholding does not exceed ten acres. The sharecropper will agree in return to carry out without further charge, and with his family, all the work of the land; and to be satisfied, instead of wages, with half of the harvest, while he will return the other half to the owner. This agreement is often the subject of a contract, to specify certain royalties and services to which the sharecropper commits himself, however the differences between the obligations of both are minimal. Utilization rules all these contracts; it compensates for the stipulations which haven't been expressed. And any master owner who would like to deviate from custom, who would demand more than another one would, and would take as a basis anything other than an equal sharing of the harvests would make himself so odious, that he could be sure of not being able to find an honest farmer. The contracts of all sharecroppers can be considered the same at least in each district, and it never gives rise to any competition between peasants who seek to place themselves on offer, to work the land at a better price than another. It is the circumstances of these sharecroppers that we will compare with those of other peasants in Europe; it's their happiness and

201

security that the half-yield culture has succeeded in ensuring to a class of men who not only do all the roughest work in the fields, but who also are without landed property and hardly possess any chattel property. That the peasant owners generally live in a larger abundance, this is to be expected from the mere fact that they are owners. That the farmers themselves can

prosper more, should not be surprising, because in order to own farm land it is necessary to have capital, and that the sharecropper does not have. But it is useless to wish sharecroppers to be richer, as then no one would ask for a sharing of land and produce. What only matters to us now, is how wealth, and work, benefits his happiness, in comparison with those who, like him, have only their working hands for all their wealth.

The Tuscan sharecropper receives all he needs to live, his subsistence, from the bosom of nature. He has almost no need for money, as he hardly has any payments to make; he does not notice the existence of taxes, because these are all payable by the owners; and since he never has to deal with the government, he generally is very attached to it. He does not have more interests to disentangle with the Church either, all its collections that he pays in church are voluntary. It's quite a long time now since the tithe was abolished in Tuscany, although its name is still used to designate some light royalties and a taxation of certain fixed funds. All the properties of the Church are currently in land, or rather in perpetual annuities on land produce which cannot give rise to dispute. The sharecropper finally, in his relations with the property owner, considers himself a partner in a common interest, and has almost nothing to discuss with him. Use has invariably fixed his rights and obligations; his contract could, true enough, be dissolved every year for bad behavior on his part. But experience has taught any owner that he always loses to send a peasant away. When no new peasant will give him more than half of the crop in any case, he can hardly win, because

202

no one can ask for more. Also the sharecropper lives on his farm as on his inheritance, attracting his affection and constantly working to improve it, trusting in the future, and knowing that his fields will be worked after him by his children and the children of his children.

Indeed, the great majority of sharecroppers live from one generation to the next on the same land. They know it in detail and with a precision that can only develop with a feel for a property. The hills of the Nievole valley are planted with olive trees, vines, mulberry trees, fig trees, fruit trees of all kinds, and wheat is cultivated at their foot; more so to keep the earth clean and loose, than for the profit that can be made with wheat. Fields raised in terraces one above the other often are no more than four feet in breadth, but there is not one whose character has not been studied in some way by the farmer. One is dry and porous, another one cold and wet; here the earth is deep, there there it's only a crust which barely covers the rock; wheat thrives better on one, rye on the other; it would be hard here and a waste of time to sow durum wheat, elsewhere the land replenishes fertility with beans and lupines, further on the flax will return wonderfully, and the edge of this stream will be suitable for hemp. One can thus with astonishment learn from a sharecropper, that in a space of ten acres, the soil, the aspects and the slope of the ground, present more variety than a rich farmer can usually distinguish on a farm of five hundred acres in extent. It is because the last one feels that he is only passing through, and reckons moreover

that he must behave by general rules and neglects the details. But as for the sharecropper, with the accumulated experience of past times, he feels his intelligence awakened both by interest and affection to become the very best of observers; and with everything in the future before him he does not think of himself alone, but of passing this knowledge on to his children and his grandchildren. Also when he plants an olive tree, a tree that will live for centuries, he studies all the layers of the land he needs to disturb, making sure that the bottom of the hollow is porous so that water flows through and doesn't stagnate, protecting the tree from harm.

203

While the happy circumstances of the sharecropper attaches him to the soil, and it becomes an object of his affections, his hopes, and his studies; this condition leaves almost no object of dispute between him and other men. Before the reforms of this year came into effect, the laws on the transfer of property were very lamentable in Tuscany; one never bought with security, one was never safe from evictions; women, minors, previous creditors, the Church, all had rights which contradicted each other, which were prescribed according to different rules, and which could still be upset endlessly by 'graces' from the sovereign or the 'consulta', a sort of council and tribunal which acted in his name.

They took away the administration of an estate from one, and allowed another to alienate substituted property from his children; and denying still a third of the support on reclaiming a dotal property that a husband already had undertaken to recompense in full; and always putting these arbitrary decisions, these 'motu proprio', as if being points of law. From there then arose a prodigious number of lawsuit between all the owners involved; and a spirit of chicanery reigned, that made few people blush when an unfair claim was put forward. But the sharecropper has the advantages of an assigned property without the inconvenience of needing to defend it. While the owner, to whom the land belongs, could well be at war with his sovereign; the sharecropper lives in peace with all his neighbors. He has no reason for rivalry or mistrust against them, and he tries to maintain a good harmony; like his master with the tax authorities or with the Church. He sells little, he buys little, he receives little money, but no one asks him for it either. We have often spoken of the gentle character and benevolence of the Tuscans, but we have not sufficiently made note of the cause which most contributed to preserving this pleasantness; it is the one which took away for all the farmers, being more than three quarters of the population, almost all occasion for strife.

When moving away from main roads and towns, and climbing the hills surrounding the valley of Nievole, our feet encounter with each step small paths; which, whirling between olive trees and vines, are never furrowed by any wheels, and are only accessible to mules loaded with their pack. Along these paths, after every few hundred steps or so, and behind some flowered crest on the side, we find a small house that presents the sweet image of an industry amply rewarded, with man's affection for the earth, abundance and peace.

This house, built of good walls, lime and cement, always being at least one storey, sometimes two, above the ground floor. Most often on the ground floor we find a kitchen, a stable for a couple of horned beasts, and a storage room called a 'Tinaia', after large vats (tini) wherein wine is fermented, without having been pressed before. This is also the room where the sharecropper stores his barrels, his oil and his wheat. Most often he also has an open shed leaning against the house, so that he can work there under cover, to fix his tools, or chopping fodder for his cattle. On the first and second floors are two, three, and often four bed rooms; windows only have shutters, they have no glass in the frames, but we must also remember that winters here are without frost. The most spacious and the best ventilated of these rooms is generally dedicated by the sharecropper, during the months of May and June, to the culturing of silkworms; large chests for keeping clothes and linen, and a few wooden chairs, are the main furniture in these rooms; but any new wife always brings her dowry chest of drawers made of walnut wood.

The beds are without posters and curtains; but on each one, besides a good guard railing filled with the elastic straw of wheat, one finds a single or two woolen mattresses stacked on top, or, among the poorest, one good quilted blanket and strong hemp cloth sheets; and, on the best bed in the family, a silk floss spread, saved for festive days. There is only a fireplace in the kitchen, the same room there is always a large wooden dining table where the family eats, with its benches and grand chest, which at the same time serves as a cupboard to keep the bread and provisions, as well as a kneader; a pretty complete but very inexpensive assortment of pots, dishes and plates made from

terracotta; one or two brass lamps, a Roman weight, and at least two red copper jugs for drawing and storing water.

All the linen and all the working clothes of the family have been spun by the women of the house. These clothes, both for the men and for women, are of the material which they call 'mezza lana' if it is thick, and 'mola' if it is light.

The weft is a thick thread either of hemp or linen, the filling is of wool or cotton; it is colored by the same peasant women who spun it. It is difficult to imagine how much, through hard work, the peasant women are able to accumulate, both of linen and of 'mezza lana'; how many sheets are there in common storage; how much each member of the family has in the way of shirts, jackets, pants, petticoats and dresses.

To make it clear, we attach in the footnote below a part of the inventory of the peasant family that we know best; they are about average in wealth, neither among the poorest nor among the richer, and they live happily with

their jobs of sharecropping on less than ten acres of land (1).

(1) Inventory of the trousseau of Jeanne, daughter of Valente Papini, at her marriage to Giovacchino Landi, April 29, 1835, in Porta Vecchia, near Pescia.

28 shirts,
3 colored silk floss dresses,
4 colored silk foil dresses,
7 Indian dresses or settler's canvas,
2 winter work dresses (mezza lana),
3 summer work dresses and petticoats (mola),
3 white skirts,
5 painted canvas aprons,
1 black silk apron,
1 black merino apron,
9 colored work aprons (mola),
4 white handkerchiefs,
8 colored handkerchiefs,
3 silk handkerchiefs,
2 embroidered veils and 1 tulle veil,
3 hand towels,
14 pairs of socks,
2 hats, one of felt, the other of fine straw,

206

All of these canvases and these fabrics which she possesses could have been, we are told, made more cheaply in factories, with sophisticated machinery; we agree, but what would peasant women do then? What are they doing in Ireland? What are the wives and daughters of the English day laborers doing? Nothing; absolutely nothing; the day laborer must maintain them alone by his wage. And it is this enforced idleness of half the population that can be assigned as one of the major causes of the misery of the proletarians. But it is not so that the women of the Tuscan peasants work only on their distaff. While everyone works in a Tuscan household, everything works without bosses, without inspectors, without surveillance of any kind; because each one works for herself and for her family, each one works with love and all the intelligence of which she is capable. In each of these small farms in the Nievole valley, two young heifers are constantly fed in the barn; however, there are no meadows, no artificial fodder, no pastures; all the grass that these heifers eat must be gathered in the fields that are thus constantly cleaned of all parasitic plants, in ditches, and along side retaining walls almost perpendicular to the beds (cigli) which support the hills. The women and children of the family are busy collecting this grass from other crops every day and chopping it with straw before giving it to cattle; but with interesting results over the years:

9 gold cameos,
2 gold earrings,
1 rosary with two Roman piastres,
1 coral necklace with its golden cross.

This wife had had 50 shillings of dowry; 20 of which was paid in cash, and the rest at term, at two shillings per year. The Tuscan shilling is worth 6 francs.

All the richer wives also have the “la vesta di seta”, a large silk dressing gown, which they only wear four or five times in their life. The most common dowry for peasant women in the rest of Tuscany, where the smallholdings are larger, is 100 shillings, 600 francs.

Men have no trousseau; the bridegroom on getting married had only 14 shirts and the rest in proportion. He now only has 13 pairs of sheets, while his wife's family has 30 pairs.

207

In the family that I have before my eyes, and who live under the same roof as we for the time being, the father and the mother are still young; they have three children of ten years, seven years and fifteen months; so they were forced to take in a young country maid that they feed, and to whom they give a little more than two francs per month as wage. She is fourteen years old; she is the one who, with the mother, feeds the heifers, cooks, runs errands, and does the laundry. The two sons are glorious at work all day with their father; the eldest, ten years old, is already intelligent and skillful; he learned from his father the reason for everything he does, and his young experience adds to that of his predecessors; he enjoys himself and rests by the variety of his occupations, and he is yet growing in strength and intelligence, while already earning his full living by his activities.

Variety, freedom, and hope are indeed the charm and the underpinning of the work in the fields, for the father and the mother, as for children. Labor begins at first dawn of the day, and it only ends when darkness already surrounds them. But this work is directed only by the intelligence and will of the one who carries it out; he finds himself attached to the thought of the result that he expects for himself and for his children. The details of it changes every day, and most often several times a day. Undoubtedly there is a certain skill of the hand involved, a regularity and an ease in repeating the same work; which are born out of habit, and which become automatic and lost from conscious thought. But this wholly bodily reaction is more than offset by the development of intelligence, when the overall bodily movements are the result of attention and will. There is for reasons both of health and for a beautiful appearance of human beings, a prodigious advantage in developing all one's muscles in turn, instead of tiring all day doing always the same, and starting all over again every following day. It is recognized that to some extent and measure, one type of work relaxes from another one almost as well as rest. And finally, it is from this variety in what needs to be done, that we see a constant interest, a constant delight emerging in the life of the poor sharecropper. In other countries the laborer is so constantly pressed by unrelenting need, that neither fun nor boredom is taken to have any meaning in his working life. He wouldn't even dare to confess that his monotony bores him.

However, it is fun or boredom that depends on enjoyment, or fatigue of life; and we should measure the happiness of the poor, as much by the amusement or boredom he experiences, as by the foods that nourish him. By following the schedule of the Tuscan farmer, we will be able to judge best: his variety of works; of the intelligence that goes into the distribution of them throughout the different seasons of the year; the mixture of the exercises that require strength with those that require skill, and that of the relaxation that man feels when passing from one to another. In the earliest three months of the year, January, February and March, the main job of the Tuscan farmer is to prune and raise the vine back up, it's a work of skill and intelligence, in which each stroke of the pruner must be reasoned, and which cannot be left to mercenary hands without quickly bringing about a ruination of the vine. The sharecropper also has to collect the olives, either by shaking the trees, a job that requires as much care as attention not to spoil the following harvest, or in collecting the olives off the ground; also a work of patience and attention – all the more painful, as the grass in which it is necessary to look for them is steeped in ice water. It then takes time in time to crush these olives in a press, and this work, continuing day and night, requires a great deployment of muscular strength.

In the months of April and May, the peasant plows with a spade and sows all the fields intended for wheat, African millet (*holcus sorgum*), lentils, chickpeas, and beans; he plows the foot of the vines in the trenches and the foot of the olive trees, which he will fertilize at the same time, but this work, which requires a great muscular effort, is interwoven with the skill of pruning the olive trees and removing their dead wood, save and direct the young shoots that

replace the damaged branches; and to prune, during the same period, the chestnut trees that cover the entire crests of the hills.

The months of June and July are mainly intended for the hay and wheat harvest; but at the same time the peasant's house is filled with growing silkworms that are hungry. They must be looked after tirelessly at night like in daylight, transfer them delicately from one mat onto another, as their litter collects, by carefully moving them one by one by hand; and finally, the mulberry trees must be stripped off their leaves as their feed, without harming the tree that bore them. At the same time the harvest of fruits begins; as they are picked they must be taken to the market, or they must be dried for a winter supply. These harvests continue for all the following months, almost until the end of the year. From the second week of July however, as soon as the wheat harvest has been completed, it is necessary to start plowing the land and to seed it again for another wheat crop. In the same month and the next the sharecroppers gather in turn to thresh one another's grain on the now open area that they have just harvested. Several hours before daybreak they cut the straw, building the sheaves, and only reserving the ears to subject them to the flail, during the

greatest great ardor of an August sun. They always come together in sufficient numbers so that all the wheat on a smallholding hill can be beaten, winnowed, and measured during the day.

But this day is for them the happiest of the year. The 'battitura' is the main celebration of the countryside; the joy of work, underpinning their courage and strength. The sharecroppers receive, and in turn render, their help and hospitality; their food is then abundant and succulent; the meat and the good wine circulate on the table they set in the open air, and often the evening ends with dancing. In the days between reciprocal invitations, the sharecropper returns to the work of the spade, which is a lot less cheerful but all the more tiring. It is the only one for which he gives himself a full hour's of rest in the middle of the day.

210

In September, the Tuscan farmer harvests durum wheat, and all the other grains he sowed in the springtime; he also pulls up the hemp; and since two months he had been snatching flax.

Preparation of filamentous plants, and de-shelling seeds are sedentary occupations that he reserves for rainy days. In the same month he cleans all the ditches that surround each field, and wherein grow the vines, cleaning them off soil too. At the same time he has a second look at the chestnut forests, to disbud them after the August sap run. October is filled with harvests and by the making of wine; in this month the chestnuts are harvested too, which continues during the next, and their desiccation by a slow fire, by means of which they are then reduced to flour and ready to be kept all year round. At the same time the sharecropper begins to sow his winter wheat with a hoe, and he continues this work until the end of December.

As we have said, the Tuscan peasant himself, with his family, consumes half of the harvests he produces. Additionally he may do some further exchanges with the owner; he could give him part of his half of the oil and wine, in exchange against the Sunday portion of the grain harvest. Also, he has little to sell and little to buy, and he can accomplish almost all his work throughout the year without touching money; however fruits, some vegetables, silk, its best wine and the greater part of its oil, are intended to be sold; while he most often buys the woods which support his vines, and the horned animals that he fattens in his stable are also commercial objects to him. He therefore needs to frequent the markets; and it is rare that he doesn't go there at least once a week. No doubt he loses a lot of time; if we have to call lost, all the time that a man employs in the tradings with other men. After all, it's the time he devotes in getting to know them and to be socializing expressing their feelings.

Other days of work interruption by the peasantry are provided by religion; all work that is not necessary is suspended then. Sunday and public holidays, and we know that in Italy they are numerous, and we do not try to confuse them with the Sabbath of the Hebrews, but in the spirit of Christianity and its charities, these invite to provide the poor with recreation, and some mixture of gaiety in their laborious lives.

While a part of these days is occupied by divine service; by far the greater part remains free, although religion somewhat influences the activities of those hours too. Each church in turn has its saint and its vogue, where the inhabitants of the countryside and the city congregate; less to receive the blessings of the church than to come together. Gallantry itself has its share in the long walks, that young people take to visit churches in remote villages. It's in these days of celebration that let the luxury of the people unfold too. The peasant waits for the heat of summer to be well advanced, before taking off the coat which covers his good cloth coat, because he is very comfortable in showing his neighbors that he has both. The peasant women wear dresses of silk fluff, and sometimes of pure silk, while their heads are adorned with a white veil; the artist does not travel through these vogues without being struck by the beauty that he finds there almost at every step he takes; the real economist is bound to be even more struck by the aspect of happiness presented by this population as a whole.

The Tuscan peasant is without pretense, but his food is healthy and varied. It is centered around an excellent wheat bread, brown, but free of bran and pure. The most skilled among the peasants of the hills recognized that the wheat, although the most expensive of all grains, is the one that returns the best value for the money; that is to say, for the same price, it contains the most nutritional sustenance. They also preferably sow it for their own use; but when their land demands some other kinds of cereal, they feed on whatever they harvest. Thus those of the plains make use of meslin and rye, durum wheat, beans, chickpeas, and African millet (the couscous of the Arabs). The peasants of the hill also use it occasionally,

as well as chestnut flour. The latter, as well as durum wheat flour, lasts well and is generally reserved for Winter. It is then prepared under the name of 'polenta', a kind of gelatinous or thick paste that is eaten hot, without any seasoning. In the bad season, in fact, the plowman especially needs hot food. He does so while having two meals a day; at ten in the morning he eats his polenta, at nightfall he eats the soup, then bread with some seasoning (*companatico*).

In summer he has three meals, at eight o'clock, at one o'clock, and in the evening. But the fire only gets lit once a day, for his dinner, which consists of soup, then a dish or salted meat, or dry fish, or beans, or herbs, which he eats with bread. Salted meat, ordinarily, comes in for only a very small quantity; because he considers that forty pounds of salted pork per person is more than enough to his supply his needs for the year. Twice a week he puts a small piece in his soup. On Sunday there always is a plate of fresh meat on the table, but a piece that weighs only a pound or a pound and a half, and is enough for the whole family, however large it may be. It also should not be forgotten that the Tuscan peasant generally collects olive oil.

They are using it, not only for lighting, but to season all the vegetables with for eating, and which thus become much tastier and more nutritious (1).

At lunch he eats bread, and sometimes cheese or fruits; at supper bread and salad. His drink is usually a lesser quality wine of the country, and vinelle or piquette – made of water and fermented grape pomace. However, he always reserves some of his best wine for the day when he will thresh his grain, and for some festivals that are celebrated with family. He estimates at ten barrels of vinelle per year (about five hundred bottles) and five bags

(1) The peasants of France, Switzerland and Savoy likewise harvest walnut oil. If there were real peasants in the British Isles, they would grow their oil seeds for the same use.

213

of wheat (good for about about a thousand pounds of bread) the portion required for a grown man.

Let us summarize the pleasures which are assured to the Tuscan peasant by the sharecropper contract; his work is varied, he is free, mentally he is supported by interest and hope, his work is sufficiently intermixed with rest and relaxation; his home is healthy, dry, airy, and sufficiently large and convenient; he is well and neatly sleeping; his clothes are suitable for work, and give him some pleasures of vanity, some satisfaction for the taste of elegance on festive days; his food is healthy, abundant and varied, and it preserves to the Tuscan people the advantages of vigor and beauty, which disappears, a few leagues away, in the places where the peasant is kept in misery (1). These are the physical conditions of the existence of the poor, and such are the rights of the working man; rights that in every country would be as unjust as impolitic to deprive a working man from them. But every man also has a right to an intellectual life also; this is a consequence of the faculties with which his creator endowed him. The Tuscan peasant has in no way been deprived. He is very sensitive to the pleasures of art, to the attraction of beauty to the imagination. Above all, he knows how to find pleasure in the beauty of his country. In the hills of the Nievole valley we find in front of each house the area where the wheat gets threshed, which rarely is more than about 150 to 200 square feet in size. Most often this is the only level space in hill country that one would encounter in all the smallholdings. It is the terraces which dominate the plains and the valley, and from where the view extends over a lovely country. Almost every time I stopped there to admire it, a sharecropper would come to enjoy my admiration, and point out visual beauties that he thought could have escaped my attention. In these areas, leaning against the house, often an orange tree, a lemon tree, some jasmines, sometimes even the gaggia (*mimosa nilotica*), whose scent is especially sweet, were planted.

(1) The subdivisions granted to the Lucquois peasants are much less favorable, and it shows in the lesser beauty of its people.

Younger peasants often adorn their hats with flowers; they surround the little oratory on the corner of the road with garlands of flowers, and if they are in love they present a bouquet of flowers each day to their paramour. But by granting them imagination, could the development of intelligence perhaps be denied to them? It is true enough that very few peasants know how to read, and any instruction that can only be obtained through books generally remains foreign to them. But let us not be too quick to believe that reading is the only way to communicate and enlighten thoughts; let us not confuse either, the slowness or laziness of the mind, which seems to increase in those for whom meditation is a rare exercise, with the fatigue caused by the conventional use of speech; listen to pick up information, without precluding the peasant, the man of the people, and judge by his speech patterns if this reading awakens in him deep thoughts or emotions; seek to ascertain whether he is fit to exercise his criticism of what he picks up, or, if on the contrary the impression is that he does not, and there is no revelation from beings superior to him, to which his reason must submit. Between the good and bad lessons that the faculty of reading puts within its reach, it is more than doubtful today that the former are predominating; readings of one's surroundings may well be acting on sensitivities and an imagination, but rarely on one's intelligence. Besides, the Tuscan peasant is in his own way subjugated to this action. There are only few families in which there is no individual either destined for the priesthood, or endowed by some other chance with a literate education. That one, on long winter evenings, will be the reader of his domestic circle. After the family recited the rosary together, he will take a book; most often the Gospel, or extracts from sacred history, or some life of one of the saints; when he is finished, he will start all over again, because the peasants, just like children, like to listen to stories they already know, but don't fully understand even though it is not a new one to them.

The Tuscan peasant is thus called upon to habitually exercise habits of mind by his religious practices. They may not always be managed with prudence, with a measured caution,

but at least they are followed with a great deal of regularity; every day we hear the gathered family recite their prayers with devotion, all under the direction of the head of the family; every Sunday all individuals having come of age attend mass, and most often in a prone position, where he receives instruction on his duties; each, more or less, in Advent or Lent, follows a course of sermons, where the fundamentals of religion are brought back to the forefront; each, at least two or three times per year, returns to the confessional booth to examine his conscience. Let us admit that even though the priest is not always worthy of his authority, that his reasons are not always enlightened, or that his moral teachings do not rest on an honorable basis, it is nonetheless certain that each individual is regularly called to a moral and intellectual exercise of his best faculties,

that he is subjected to a constant action which calls for spiritualization. We don't have to look far and wide to find entire populations to whom the ideas of the invisible world are never presented, or who pay no attention to them. It is easy to decide who will be the most noble creature: the one who knows only his material existence and who thinks only of matter, or the one who has learned to feel that he has a soul.

The language of the Tuscan peasant is almost the same as that of someone in the upper class; so that dialect doesn't raise barriers between the various conditions. Communicating ideas has become faster and more habitual; national poetry is an enjoyment made just as available to the common man, as to one who has received a distinguished education. More than one traveler has noticed how well great poets, who expressed the glory of Italy, are known, are recited, are sung by men who cannot read. Moreover, the taste for improvisation in verse is universal among the common people. I will not answer for the grammatical correctness of the verses that I hear improvised in the streets, I will even admit that I noticed the disagreeable rhythm with which one recites them, and never mind their meaning.

216

Who can deny however the intellectual culture of a people in whom the taste for improvisation in verse is so universally widespread? Finally, the theater is a school for the Tuscan people teaching them poetry, language and mythology. The peasants of the valley of Nievole attend the show on feast days, in summer, from nine to eleven in the evening.

Their admission hardly costs them five pennies. Alfieri is their author of choice; the whole history of the Atrides is familiar to those men who do not know how to read, but who will seek relaxation from their hard work from the works of this austere poet.

But, one might say, these are idle pleasures, conveying a luxury spirit; before dealing with those, shouldn't we know if the peasants have learned what is necessary for them to know in the way of agricultural science? If we consult the Tuscan agronomists, they will talk to us about the peasants' prejudices, of their ignorance. But these prejudices are often the anchor of safety of society, they slow down innovations of which the theoreticians seldom foresee all the consequences of. So an ignorance of books could perhaps even be an advantage that they have over their masters. These latter admire the theoretically perfected agriculture of the 'ultramontanes', to be found however only in a few model farms. But common agriculture, universal agriculture, is superior in Tuscany than any you would find in any other country in the world. The one that excites my admiration in particular is the one universally practiced in the valley of Nievole; which is a country undoubtedly favored by its climate, but certainly not by its soil as it is not very fertile. This is where we observe as large a population living in abundance and being secure than will be found in any other country in the world. In the past it had to be up to all the industrious hands of the region, to create Canaanite agriculture; these hanging gardens, these terraces one above the other, planted with olive trees, fig trees or vines, and rising from the plain to the top of the mountains. The men at the time

who accomplished this wonderful work, have, as far as intelligence and patience is concerned, nothing to fear from a comparison with the most learned and skillful.

These terraces maintain a level ground on steep slopes

217

modified to four feet deep, which in all other systems of culture, would soon be washed away by the torrents of rain to which this country is exposed. In fact, in other parts of Tuscany we only see in their place gaunt and sterile rocks. These terraces therefore achieve everything – in the way of beauty, the healthiness, and the wealth of the country. Where would we have found the necessary capital for such a prodigious work, intelligence to design it, and the daily vigilance to immediately repair any damage caused by nature?

In the sharecropper's contract, in the fate it assured to the peasant, in the love he nurtured in himself for his smallholding, in the guarantee it gave him that he and his children would reap from generation to generation the fruits of their industry, of their economy and care. The work of the peasant of the valley de Nievole was immense, but it was gloriously rewarded. There is perhaps no country where the class that does all the work in the fields, is better nourished, better dressed, better housed, and where it works more happily; where moreover, this intelligent and diligent work is interspersed with a more complete and sweeter rest. Similarly there has nether been a time nor place where the deployment of physical forces has been less harmful to intelligence, where thought has been more constantly associated with bodily work in order to direct it, where moral sentiment has been preserved more fully by the suppression of almost all struggles of interest which divide and embitter men, where imagination itself, the very faculty of luxury in a way, of mankind, was better put to use, and where the feeling or the enjoyments of artistic expressions, in music, painting, poetry, were more beneficially set aside for the common man.

What else can we possibly want? Isn't the purpose of political economy to procure as much happiness as possible, to the greatest number, from all the material means available to human labor? When this goal is achieved, can we still wonder whether such an agricultural system results in the greatest net product, whether it enlivens trade the best, whether it offers the largest taxable output to a

218

government! Yes, maybe we will still wonder, and we are prepared to take up the challenge and respond in the affirmative.

For a nation to achieve the goal of humans consorting with one another, for it to rise to civilization, by cultivating the development of thought and all the faculties of the soul, as well as those of the body, so that it can be completed, it must contain rich, men of average means, and the poor. It is necessary, for national progress, to have men of leisure as well as men who suffer; men who ask for and get rewarded for the highest efforts of

the human mind, and men who are encouraged by bodily work. Tuscany presents indeed this happy gradation of human conditions. There is hardly any condition where the man of manual labor has lost touch with, and is irrevocably removed from the influence of intellectually endowed men and from men of leisure. The same route and distance as must be traveled in France to go from one castle to another, applies in Tuscany when going from a small town, a small center of civilization to another. In France the castle is inhabited by a single country gentleman, who lives on the revenue of his land, stretching off into the distance; and also from other lords of other castles to limit the effects of society, and to dispose of it by hunting and other exercises of the body rather than those of the mind. In Tuscany every small town contains twenty to thirty families who enjoy the full independence, as that of the French country gentleman, but on whom the spirit of association exercised a much more civilizing influence. It's true enough that in England, we find, compared to the population or to the land area, as many well-off families as in Tuscany; but the great majority of them do not get their revenue from the land. Instead, since enriched by industry and commerce, and having their capital in public funds, or living from the rich entitlements that the State and the Church grant to their civil servants, these families have become foreign to agriculture. The country of England is almost entirely divided up; in it belonging to a few lords who have collected colossal fortunes, and whose very opulence keeps them at an immense distance from the cultivators of the soil.

219

We have said it before however, that the number of those who lived in Tuscany three or four centuries ago in a happy mediocrity was infinitely greater than it is today.

We deeply regret this is so; we believe that it is a misfortune for the State that the extinction of all these families, which in each village introduced the habits of ease and of a certain liberality. We attribute this change to political causes, to the monarchical spirit which replaced the republican spirit, to the centralization of government, to the eagerness of all the rich to come to the capital and especially at court, and the luxury that court life encourages. We likewise became aware with sorrow, that a new revolution has taken place in territorial fortunes, over the last thirty years or so. Some men enriched by commerce quickly rose to a most prodigious opulence; those bought with all eagerness the heritages of former owners, and the beneficent influence of wealth has been lost to the countryside where it was born; because the 'nouveau riche', who alone replaced thirty or forty provincial families, soon left the province for the capital. But as they grew older, most of the old families, even in the capital, were spiraling into a decline.

Here, as in all of Europe, greed and patriotism allied together to perfect the productive means of everything, to bring to all markets more products, both agricultural and industrial, than could possibly be sold. The war that so quickly consumes all things, the war that buys with national capital, by

loans, a production that should only be exchanged against revenue, has, for several years now, given quite an artificial encouragement to this exuberance of productions. Agriculture raised rapid fortunes; it seemed that we could never bring too much wheat, oil, wine, onto the markets; although the harvests were abundant, the commodities rose at excessive prices too. Also, from all parts one saw culture spread, the undertaking of new clearings; the owners got into debt for

220

borrowing beyond their strength, to clear beyond their means. They got into debt to pay the dowry in money of their daughters or sisters, because the influence of French legislation made women be treated more favorably than before; while at the same time, each owner opposed an invincible repugnance to the alienation of any part of his heritage. So in the midst of a rare agricultural prosperity, and with most owners having assumed debts; when the consumption of war suddenly ceased, and with it the purchase of annual fruits with the capital of the nations; then the overabundance of products over needs was immense. And the freedom of commerce, for which the Tuscan government had long been celebrated, was supposedly at fault; while above all, the progress of agriculture itself should have been blamed. Foodstuffs fell to half, often to a third of their previous value; the owners who had no debts could still stay afloat by reducing their expenses. But this resource could not save those who had big interest payments. Three times more food had to be returned to face a demand that had not changed; yet they preferred instead to borrow again, and they always got themselves stuck deeper in the hole.

Another cause came to hasten their collapse. A penchant for trips abroad had awakened with all the more fury, since they had long been impossible. All England seemed eager to come and enjoy the delights of the Garden of Europe. These travelers came to show off, in the eyes of the Tuscans, their opulence and the elegance of their accoutrements. Tuscan nobility, one of the most illustrious in Europe, could not patiently endure to be crushed in its own country by the luxury of foreigners.

In these palaces whose magnificence is truly royal, they yet blushed for being overcome by the elegance and good taste of their guests. The pure luxury of the ancient Italian nobility was secular; magnificence was passed on down from generation to generation; but although striking to the eyes, it really cost the family far less than the fugitive luxury, that moreover is also subject to the fashion empire, which one only seeks today; giving

221

just a moment of pleasure, and evaporating like the perfume of flowers, or the chords of music. To furnish their living rooms with this perfection of the elegance of the day; elegance, which tomorrow will be nothing but old fashion.

Many Tuscan nobles, who still felt themselves rich, who imagined that the agricultural crisis was temporary, have finished to ruffle their fortunes. It

is for these various reasons that caused almost everyone with a historically distinguished name to be in debt, and that a part of the palaces that we still admire no longer belong to the families who made them famous. It is in all countries where the rich are in debt and anxiously embarrassed, that caused the ruin of the peasant. This effect isn't so noticeable for the sharecropper; but for this very reason there is talk in Tuscany of changing the system of smallholdings. Homeowners who feel embarrassed in their affairs see no other means of recovering than to force new developments in agriculture. But this authority is misleading; because their current sufferings come from overabundance and the decline in commodity prices. All their efforts however, only tend to lower them even more. They complain about what their sharecroppers oppose – the introduction of new so-called perfected methods. But what is perhaps the most to be desired, is that this opposition is effective, and that agriculture remains stationary until consumption has reached the level of production, and raised prices, The sharecropper rejects the extirpation of vines and olive trees to subject the fields to large-scale cultivation; he rejects the perfected plow and the extirpator; he is pushing back on anything that makes human labor unnecessary; for he would be pushing an increase in the net product to which he himself would be the sacrificial lamb.

But this increase is deceiving the owner himself; because the economy he wants to introduce into his agriculture tends to make the consumers of his wheat disappear. So what is the use of producing more? Such, however, is the fermentation which agitates the owners today. It makes us tremble; for the admirable system which we have just exposed, is founded only on habits, is guaranteed only by opinions. If once we think we are allowed to demand more from the peasant than his fathers gave, to change his condition, to impose other royalties on him,

222

soon he will be submitted to the mad auction which holds all the land in Ireland in its disturbing grip, and the happiest of cultivators on earth today may join the most unfortunate in Ireland.

The situation of the farmer as set by his sharecropper's contract not only affects his relationship with the owner, it also influences the prosperity of industry and commerce. As our earlier representation made clear already, we can take it for granted that by far the largest part of the population provides for its own needs, without any trade or exchanges. The peasant eats his own bread, drinks his own wine, puts on his woolen and hemp clothing, which is spun, woven, and sewn by the family itself. So by that habit they are estranging from human society, which is only supported by mutual services. It is true, that he does not exchange more than what is superfluous to him, but he has the superfluous; and what happiness for a nation to be assured that the great mass of the population, the numerous class of cultivators, enjoys some superfluity! What an advantageous circumstance at the same time for the nation's commerce! Because real commerce is based on domestic consumption and on the ease of all. The

Tuscan peasant does not buy, true enough, his festive clothes, and these last for perhaps six or eight years; but take an inventory of his wardrobe, of his utensils, of his furnishings; and deduct from those everything that is homemade instead of having been bought, and it will still be found that the encouragement he gives to commercial activity is infinitely greater than that is given, not only by the Irish day laborer, but by the English day laborer as well. Then, further observing the markets and shops existing in the small towns of Tuscany, and we will be convinced that the natural trade, that which arises from the real needs of the country, is considerable there; and we can't but be convinced again that there really is no lasting prosperity for industry other than what is based on the ease and happiness of the overwhelming majority of the population. Modern economists, and especially financiers, consider

223

nations from yet another point of view: it is much less on their mind to provide for a good administration of society, and each of its citizens with an abundance around his home, than extracting from him a considerable revenue by taxation, and devoting that to further the magnificence of the sovereign, or to the national defense. This last aim, the most expensive of all, usually, asks from the Tuscans fewer sacrifices than most other nations do. Small populations can no longer defend themselves today anyway; their independence is no longer within their own hands; instead it is entrusted to treaties and public law, which, to some extent, are respected by European mainstream society.

Tuscany, which is about as large and powerful as Switzerland, maintains only six thousand soldiers, for its police rather than for its defense; and it perhaps should still be regarded as an unnecessary luxury. But if Tuscany has no army or national guard, Switzerland has no sovereign power. That of Tuscany is maintained with splendor in palaces which the greatest kings of Europe could look upon with envy; the treatments it grants are rich and numerous; at the same time all its goings on are under the sustained focus of government attention. By the advance of a very large capital, it cleared a whole region from floods, that of 'Chiane'. Today it is spending an even more considerable capital to clean up, cultivate, and populate the region of 'Maremma'. The main roads are in such a perfect state of construction and repair, that there is no country where one travels so quickly, and at less cost. The paths, through hills and mountains, which are only accessible by beasts of burden are crisscrossing in all directions and, are maintained by the public with almost as much care, and most are paved as well. Justice is brought closer to the people; there are few inhabitants who have more than six miles to go to appear in the closest court of their citizenship. Also, its municipal authorities are much closer by, because each town and village, and almost every 'castello', is administered from within. In all these municipalities, one or two doctors are maintained at public expense, with the obligation to take care of the poor free of charge; because authority sees itself as the guardian of public health.

We find large hospitals with considerable endowments in all its cities, schools everywhere; churches and chapels served by a considerable number of ecclesiastics, not only in each parish, but less than one mile away from each dwelling, and in towns of pious foundations ensuring a great splendor for worship. For now it is not a question of examining whether all these funds are well administered, if all these public officials carry out their duties in the most beneficial way to society. We wanted to assert only the point that a nation organized as we have just represented it, is amply able to meet its public expenses, that it can do so without taxes being too oppressive, without discouraging either agriculture or industry of all sorts, without any service being neglected, and finally without the state needing to incur debt. We believe that in Tuscany also, there are abuses to correct; that its people not only have the right to be happy, but also to know how happy they are and to hold in their own hands all the guarantees to his happiness. Although we are far from wanting to freeze the spirit of reforms, this country, which we love as a second homeland, we like to present as an example to other peoples. We invite anyone to look at one's own condition after reforms, often inspired by others, were implemented; in order to convince themselves that imitation is not always an improvement, and that the progress to which they might have been attracted to, wasn't in fact only a retrogressive movement.

Should we conclude, therefore, from the happy condition of peasants in Tuscany, for the wealth they are spreading throughout the country, the abundance they themselves enjoy, the benevolence that the contract under which they work seems to maintain order from one generation to another, that this is a country where no pressing reforms are needed, and that all the wishes of the economist philosopher, just like all the work of government administrators should be limited

to prevent anything from changing? no, not at all. Tuscany is still capable of considerable progress too, which will perhaps double its cultivable area, its population sustainability; and so its production and its consumption.

We can study, from the example Tuscany provides, not only the means by which the great mass of the population has been made happy, but also the gradual improvement that Providence has in store for it. Wealth increases there as culture expands, making it spread successively under all its going conditions, without in any way upsetting an ongoing equilibrium, without the economic benefits of any being bought by the sufferings of others. This future progress, which has already started, and which is linked up with the noble example of patriotic dedication, deserves to be explained in some further detail.

Tuscany, surrounded, on the north and to the east, by the Apennine belt and to the west and south, by the sea, consists of an undulating surface area which cannot be said to belong either to the mountains or to plains. The slope of the Apennines alone is susceptible to this Canaanite culture;

of these suspended terraces, which above all testify to the beauty and the wealth of the Nievole Valley and the Lucca region. Moreover, the river basin is enriched by alluvial soil, and only it returns good harvests; but a large part of the Tuscan territory is covered by hills made up of alternating beds of tuff and clay. Tuff is a block of calcareous sand whose inner adhesion is so minimal that the slightest pressure, the slightest effort of flowing water destroys it; clay, on the contrary, does not allow itself to be penetrated by water, and so that stagnates on its surface. Both though are absolutely sterile. Also, nothing is sadder than the aspect of these chains of hills, which, on both sides, border its rivers and rapids, and present, at a height of just three hundred to a thousand feet, only gaunt peaks; some whitish, others dark yellow, but without vegetation covering it anywhere. Experience, however, has long since shown that mixing calcareous sand with clay forms a kind of marl, a very rich soil, which indeed gives,

226

in the bottom of the valleys where the torrents carried these substances to and mixed them together, very abundant harvests. But no human force could ever be sufficient to achieve this type of mixture. The beds are very deep, and the hills of tuff and clay, are located at too great a distance; so that we can only think of transporting the already mixed elements from one location to the other.

The Tuscans however invented an ingenious procedure, which enabled them to take advantage of the mixture that water power deposited on the bottom of its valleys. This is what was called a 'sealing', the enclosing of marshes. The low places which the waters rendered sterile by their lengthy stay were surrounded with dikes; and then, now proceeding in a man-made environment, the wait was for heavy rains, when these were most heavily loaded with silt, to deposit all the fertile substances of which they were saturated before letting them runoff. It is by this method that the soil of formerly flooded land was raised; among others in the province 'delle Chiane'; soon afterward the contractors of this project were rewarded for their concentrated fertility creation. Later, a most brilliant man, whose name was Testaferrata, a simple peasant from the lands of the Marquis of Ridolfi, in the valley of Elsa, sought and found a way to fertilize the hills by an analogous operation. He invented the 'colmate di montagna', or the art of depositing, by the action of water on the slope of the hills, the fertilizing elements that these same waters would be removing under his direction at the highest peaks; and he evoked thus vast deserts to one day become the inspired theater of industrious man. To succeed, he had to find a way to decompose by rainwater these arid summits which crown most of the hills, and then to lead the waters laden with silt towards the hillsides he wanted to fertilize, to combine them so that the mixture of pulverized limestone with clay always operate by itself in happy proportions, and finally to provide them with a series of rest stops, so that they would deposit all their silt, and

did not leave the hill without having covered all their former bareness. In addition, the engineer had to design in his mind, the form that the hill would take when it was stripped of all its protuberances, as the sculptor sees in advance the statue outline he will create in the block of marble from which he extracts it. It was furthermore necessary to coordinate the plantations; which, as that ground recovers fertility, go up from the plain towards the top of the hills; cultures had to be found for these successively elevated areas, by which these virgin lands could be made susceptible to agriculture before being changed into smallholdings, so that sustenance wasn't lost, and the great agricultural operation always paid for itself. Testaferrata, the original inventor of the 'colmate di montagna', died about ten years ago, in old age, but as an outstanding citizen; the Marquis Ridolfi, perfected and supplemented his discoveries. We can not without admiration see, in Meleto, these channels carved on the edges of tuff or clay, each year in a new direction, but still on the steepest slopes; so that, during heavy rains, the soil will be dragged along like thick lava, that hundreds of arms will scoop at incessantly to spread out. And these same channels, flowing halfway up the same hills by a winding course that is interrupted by many locks, so that the silt they deposit is also, with the arms of men, thrown away from their edges, which then fertilizes belts of vines bordering narrow fields and next the fields themselves. Then, successively going higher up wherever the operation is carried out, and indicating the creation of new grounds to feed the human species, to hasten the work of water, to shape the ground, to dig reservoirs from which artificial flows are released, whenever necessary, employing powerful implements, equipment that was either invented from scratch or perfected. But these are machines that, instead of condemning those who from then on exist in idleness will call new arms to work; machines that create a new countryside to be populated by new inhabitants. In fact, as soon as the flow of water made all these

ridges of tuff and clay which crisscrossed the surface of the hillsides, as soon as a fledgling new crop fattened by the silt deposited by the channels, created a little field, and vines were planted in the ditch that bordered a dike; a new house is built, and a new family now becomes responsible for the cultivation, in half-yield fashion, of this newly created land, and the Marquis Ridolfi will continue to operate in new barrens. So the population is increasing, but in a fair proportion to the work required with land having been made ready for vegetation. The rural products are increasing now, but again in a fair proportion to the revenue of the farmers that is dedicated to be consumed; commercial development follows suit, and does not precede the formation of new happy families. A new colony is somehow founded at the center of a having been civilized country since thousands of years; but it is a colony according to the ancient spirit, all intended for progress and the happiness of the colonists.

The Marquis Ridolfi had long sought to make the owners of the rest of Tuscany aware of the procedures by which they could restore their barren hills to fertility; but although the invention of the 'colmate di montagna', dates back nearly forty years now, it had not spread. It requires, in fact, practical knowledge too varied and too extensive, for only writings and sketches to be complete enough to enable it to be understood. Finally this generous man decided, three years ago, to found in Meleto a rural and experimental school, where he devoted himself tirelessly with his young woman assistant, from the Guicciardini, to educate the local peasants, who then will be able from hill to hill to convey this beneficent industry. Eighteen young pupils, sons of sharecroppers and some agents, have been coming, along with his own three sons, to sit at the benches of the school, where the Marquis Ridolfi himself teaches them everything they will need to know about the exact and natural sciences to underpin in theory their upcoming projects; then his sons, with the young peasants go, for several hours a day, to work the earth with hoe and spade. The Marquis Ridolfi teaches them all about drawing; other masters complete their

229

education, and the whole family takes turns in being a noble example of brotherhood, of charity, of all the virtues and religion which serves as their safeguard.

230

SEVENTH ESSAY

Duties of the Sovereign toward Irish Cultivators and the Means of Removing their Distress from them.

In the Essay before the previous one, we committed to making known how, according to Mr. Inglis, the deplorable state to which the vast majority of the population in Ireland has been reduced. We left out the whole picturesque part of his journey, all the observations that served to paint the Irish character, all statistical research on the commerce of different cities, and their either growing or decreasing prosperity. We focused only on the condition of the laborer, of the man who does all the works in the city and the countryside, and we extracted from that research,

in the words of our traveler, the representation of a state of society which inspires almost as much terror as it does pity. We could further complete the picture of Ireland, and show, in this unhappy country, what deep hatred separates, in the name of religion, the Protestants and the Catholics; with what bitter feeling the latter pay a tithe on their necessities, to maintain a clergy whom they regard as heretics and members of a cult. What anger, what aggravation the small farmer feels against the one who comes to offer his master a rent increase, and who, by driving him off his land, condemns him to starving with his family and die. What callousness the masters, or the lawyers they employ, display by accomplishing these 'ejectments', these evictions of the farmer or the tenant of a

231

thatched cottage to put another wretch in his place. How often have they had the roof of this cottage knocked down to force its inhabitants into leaving it; and, on the other hand, with what ferocity peasants defend themselves, often rising up to massacre all members of the family they were forced into making room for. And all these other violent incidents of outrageous disturbances: nocturnal assassinations, fires, kidnappings of young girls, of perjury before the courts, so as to either condemn or force a discharge, without any regard for justice, friends or enemies. So we would have put more completely, before the reader's eyes, a state of society that is without equal among the wildest nations on earth; but which is amazing especially in Ireland. Because there is such a dramatic contrast with the countless castles, the parks, the gardens, where an opulent nobility lives in the midst of these desperate people, surrounded by all the pleasures of luxury, all the masterpieces of fine art. How not to shudder when seeing not only the men who suffer, but those who enjoy their days regardless? Don't they seem to be dancing around, smitten with wine and their heads crowned with flowers, on the edge of a precipice? Can we any longer deceive ourselves about the fate that awaits them? Can they themselves, they who find themselves in the midst of a great nation animated against them by a secret hatred, by a nation preparing for the moment of revenge, mainly concealed, but from time to time letting flashes of fury escape? In England and Ireland one calls 'rent', par excellence, an owner's gross revenue; and the 'rack rent' is rent scraped, rent extorted, rent wrested by torture, this excessive rent that the Irish landlord wrests from the poor farmer. This shuddering name is all too expressive and too prophetic; the 'rack rent' is indeed the result of torture, as well as a seed of torture. Who could recall all the cruel torments it has inflicted, that it still inflicts every day upon the Irish peasants? Who could foretell all the tortures with which it threatens the Irish aristocracy, when the day of revenge, towards which it is rushing, will have arrived? Who

232

could say how many misfortunes, indeed how many crimes we could be sparing the poor nation, by rendering the rack rent system impossible, by

completely deducting the whole class of farmers to any further possibility of tyranny on the part of the landowners?

This double deliverance, both from its masters and from slavery, let us not hesitate to say it, can only be obtained by imposing a limit to the right of property, that by attacking head-on this favorite principle of the English landowner, that everyone should be master of doing what he wants “with what is his”. This principle is fallacious: property is a concession of the law, it is under the guarantee of the law, it must be subject to the law. Property was invented for the greatest benefit of all, it thus cannot be used to cause the misery of all. It was a beautiful idea of the ancient legislator to give the owner the feeling of perpetuity and that of independence. These two sincere feelings undoubtedly contributed a lot to inspire in him the spirit of conservation and improvement, but they themselves are only a means and not an end goal. Extreme cases call for legislative intervention to bring them back to their goal. So, for example, the property of land was secured for the greatest possible development of agriculture, and with it the abundance of food for everyone. The owner would not have the right to say: “I do not want men to live off the products of my land; I do not want my land to bear fruit”. He does not have the right to say either: “I do not want my land to continue to be inhabited by the workers who were born there, I do not want that it is crossed by trade routes, I do not want its borders to be crossed by a human being”.

However, the authority of government does not generally intervene to stop such abuse of property; it relies on the number of owners amongst whom there will be very few who indulge in such whims, who are so blinded to their own interests, and it would rather let them exceed their rights than to disturb public safety.

But if the four or five hundred owners between whom the land of a certain country is divided, blinded by some ambition or some spirit of revenge, combined their efforts to banish a nation of all its homes, to condemn its soil to sterility, to close all its highways and also prohibit trade and

industry there, the legislator would not fail to tell them: “You are violating the contract under which you are holding your landed property; you abuse the tolerance with which I left some of you turn your cultivated land into parks, dismiss the plowmen, shut down communications, impoverish the nation that you were to enrich, you did not have an allowance to do so, even in isolation; and even less will I allow you to join forces to do so”. Political passions alone would explain the attacks against general opulence which we have just assumed, and there are but a few belittled people who were called upon to stand on guard against them. But the system of ‘rack rents’, tortured rents, is not the least abuse of the right of property, it is no less fatal to the nation on which we exercise it, it is no less contrary to the interests of the owners themselves. Its absurdity however, does not right away become obvious; on the contrary, it begins by flattering the owner's direct interest, and even more so his vanity, in giving him the reputation of having a greater revenue that he cannot indeed recover, and it is with this

reflection, just as with greed, that people who think only of their interests strive to extract from the earth whatever they can wrest from its cultivator. The right of the legislator to regulate the conditions of cultural contracts, and to limit property rights, cannot in our eyes be called into question; we believe that it should be exercised in any country where experience has demonstrated that the contract in use is detrimental to society as a whole, and that private interests of its owners are in no way a sufficient guarantee for the interest of all. But in the British Empire, it is not enough to having established this as a principle, owners will still have to be convinced that it is in their interest to limit their prerogatives themselves, because it is after all with them that the power of law making ultimately

234

rests. Maybe they ought to be thinking therefore, that it's about time to start ensuring their own safety! In Ireland they are only a handful of rich men scattered among millions of miserable people. Every man of the privileged class can count on five hundred individuals over him of a class he doesn't fall into; and there is such an existential opposition between them that the rich man might as well be saying to the poor: "our life is your death"; with the poor man then replying: "your death would be our life". Frequent explosive events – the destruction of crops and properties, fires, and a few assassinations are the daily symptoms of this deep seated hostility. However the Irish aristocracy distinguishes itself, in general, by brilliant courage; it does not want to give in to fear or threat; it is armed to defend what it believes to be its rights; we have it from good authority to be asking for combat, 'to conquer Ireland again', and it often provokes them with an inconceivable daring, which until now the poor class have not accepted. The rich accuse them of cowardice, they claim that a few gunshots will always dispel any Irish crowd. They could be wrong, there is still in all the Irish people a prodigious respect for one's rank, for social distinctions; but there is also this bravery, this impetuosity, this intoxication of anger, this carelessness for death, whether to give it or to receive it, which today shines in the aristocracy, when two or three men will defend their castle against hundreds of assailants. But who will cause the extinction of the aristocracy, when its blood begins to flow? As to this day, the Irish peasant takes revenge on the tithe collectors, on the officers of justice, on the valets of the distinguished, and especially on the peasant who, by collaborating, puts himself in rivalry with them. But when the nobleman appears at the windows 'to play shot', the peasant does not retaliate, and he will just run away. Respect for rank and for symbolization could decrease rapidly, however; hatred between orders becomes every day more fierce, the feeling of injustice has won all hearts, obedience to the laws is no longer found, and

235

the brake of religion no longer stops on the path of crime either; or the fanatics themselves have put their own consciences at ease through false

interpretations. It's true enough that the peasants are disarmed, but with their shillelaghs they would soon overtake the weapons of their enemies. If once a castle is taken by force, if all its inhabitants are massacred, all the other castles will soon be treated in the same way.

So Ireland would be lost; because popular fury, which can indeed destroy everything is incapable of reorganizing and rebuild anything. This respect for rank which today constitutes the only guarantee of the Irish aristocracy, and which prevents the peasant from ever measuring himself on an equal footing with his landlord, is the last trace of an entirely different order of things; of an order of things which assured the Lord power and honor, but which reciprocally guaranteed the peasant ample subsistence, a security, a confidence in the future, which he does not know anymore. It was the lord who destroyed this ancient paternity relationship of affection and respect, between the owner and his tenants; he traded the power he exerted on their hearts, against pounds sterling. But he must not flatter himself that the money he has preferred over everything else will remain his, once it is no longer under the guarantee of affection and long established habits.

Ireland, like England, like all Western Europe, underwent the revolution which abolished slavery, and replaced it by the serfdom of the soil. When, after the long invasions of the Barbarians with all their devastations, the Roman Empire fell, and the condition of the slave owners in the midst of it had become too precarious to be able to hold out longer. We have no details on this revolution, nor on any private transactions that changed the relationship between owner and cultivator. For this was a time of profound ignorance when one did not write, and neighboring States had no relations with each other. One did not dream either to make any legislation uniform from province to province, nor to transmit its details to posterity.

The legislation was the custom, the custom of the manor, rather than that of the kingdom; but this custom of modifying written charters was sacred, and no one thought to deviate from it.

It is under the protection of custom, always of benefit through its thousand varieties, that the almost annihilated population, suddenly took on a huge development; so that the forests and swamps that encroached on the whole continent gave way again to culture and dwellings. The Lord had inherited or had conquered barrens; he claimed to be the owner, but he did not take any fruit. When he had the fortuitous thought of bringing together a lot of men under his banner, to gain respect, to make himself feared, he gave to every peasant he could attract a piece of land, for him to build his cottage on, so that he plowed the clearings of the woods, raised crops and that his followers and he could now finally experience the fruits of his labor. The land he had given to his peasant was deserted, and brought nothing; he didn't ask for anything but 'services'. Sometimes, as a sign of recognition and homage, he demanded of him a peppercorn every year, sometimes a denarius, sometimes a measure of wheat, a head of his flock, sometimes, and more often perhaps, a determined number of working days. But in all

cases, the royalty was completely disproportionate to the value of the land. Also the farmer's family lived in a significant abundance. However the outward appearance of the peasant was crude, almost savage; he made all his own clothes, all his furniture, all his implements, but he was in want of wood and straw for construction and heating. Bread and meat were never lacking on his table, and neither was beer, mead, or any other fermented beverage which he prepared himself. From the lord's perspective, it was the man who was the real revenue from the earth, the man who fought for him, who obeyed him in everything, who was devoted to him in life and death. This man does not recognize any other superior, another judge, another legislator, other captain, other defender, than his lord. The power of the Lord, like all unlimited power, was

237

often exercised with caprice, sometimes with cruelty; his judgments were sometimes iniquitous, and his passions were not contained. The daughters of his vassals, if they were pretty, had little chance of escaping his desires; a resistance to his will, an offense, was sometimes punished with appalling cruelty. However the need he felt before all the others, was that of the love and cooperation of his vassals, it was their dedication, their loyalty, which were his strength and his pride. He had succeeded to appear to them as a being of a higher nature; a kind of worship joined to obedience. In the middle ages, the veneration, affection and trust of the little to the big one, emerge from all the circumstances that are known. The peasant devoted himself to his lord, as citizens should be devoting themselves only to the motherland. There was no struggle of interest between them, no desire to win over each other. The passions, the whims of the Lord, could suddenly well injure, or even crush the peasant; but generally, passions are rare and momentary explosions, it is only the interest of greed that is constant. This interest nowadays having become the main motivation for society, at that time hardly entered into any transaction.

The whole feudal organization of society existed in Ireland until a time which is still fresh in the memory of men. Ireland's agricultural population was sufficient for its territory, but was nowhere overabundant. It had been subjecting the soil to a primitive culture, without any improvements, but which nevertheless made the soil produce enough so that the peasant could live in abundance; and so that the lord, whose own plot was worked on in turn by his vassals, found sufficiency in its yield for the crude hospitality of the middle ages. This lord, according to the law, according to the titles he had in his custody, was sole proprietor of all the land in the seignury; but, in accordance with the custom of the manor, the greater part of this ground was held in villénage for a nominal rent. The landowner regarded his men well, like the true fruits of the ground, but these fruits were his peasants, men who were devoted to him in life until death, who knew no laws superior to his will, and no social order that they were not ready to trample on as soon as their lord ordered it.

Ireland was conquered by the English during the reign of Henry II (1172), but the real conquest of the country was never accomplished, because the peasant never detached himself from his lord, nor ever recognized another master than him, he never ceased to oppose a violent resistance to the orders which reached him from England, whenever the Lord ordered him to do so. These daily struggles, on all points of the territory, were the cause of the bloodthirsty laws of the English against the natural savages of the land, 'the wild Irishmen', and of this hostility between England and Ireland which had already been happening for centuries at the time of the Reformation.

It was the Protestant reformation that finally violently upset this social state, the reformation that the Irish rejected, that the English wanted to impose on them by force, and which led to the great rebellion of its Lords and the eventual conquest of Ireland by Cromwell. Much of the land of Irish lords was then confiscated, and distributed to English and Protestant masters.

But it was not the lord's enclosures alone that was taken from him, and who passed to new owners; all lands held in villénage by his vassals were also subjected to new conditions. In the eyes of the law, and according to all titles of possession, these lands belonged to the lord. According to the old customs of the manor, however, they really belonged to the peasant, under the charge of an almost negligible royalty. This custom was counted for as meaning nothing; the affection of the peasants for an enemy, and in their eyes illicit, family was only a title of reprobation. The English central authority wanted to break the link between the lord and the peasant, since he was establishing an empire within the empire. The English thought only of changing the services, dedication, and the full obedience of their new vassals, in terms of pecuniary rents. Instead of love and bravery, which they neither had the slightest interest in asking for, nor would have been expecting from their enemy peasants, they demanded rack rents, tortured rents.

So not only the property of the great rebel Lords, but also that of the entire agricultural population was in some way confiscated. Titles of the current owners therefore are fraudulent, the property isn't theirs, half of it belongs to their peasants. Also we must see with what religious affixation the Irish peasant preserves the memory of the old order and division of the country, the former owners, the fallen Catholic nobility; as he knows or thinks he knows which inheritances really belong to whom, and how willing he is to conspire to hasten the time when everyone will return to claim their rights. Mr. Inglis alludes to this general sentiment (Vol. II, ch. 2, p. 19); but it is exhibited with much more liveliness in spirit in the writings of a Protestant minister from Ireland, in whom we find united, by a strange combination, the most ardent fanaticism, with the purport of accurate observation, and the most pathetic dramatic talent. (Irish mothers and sons; Irishmen and Irishwomen)

The revolution conducted by Cromwell dates back only by a hundred and eighty years; moreover, that was only the beginning then. The new owners could neither have given birth to, nor to suddenly have brought an entirely new population to Ireland. They needed to take advantage of their land, and they were forced to give them to the peasants who offered to cultivate it for them. These were limited in number, their habits were established, they hardly understood the terms of any other contract than that which they had been making with their former lords.

So for a long time they only paid a 'quit rent', an annuity that was totally disproportionate to the proceeds of the soil. They maintained, not love but respect and fear for their new masters, just as they had had for their former masters. Yet they agreed to in principle, that what they would have had every right to dispute, that they were not just "tenants at will", tenants fully dependent on the will of the owner; so that therewith he could be dismissing them whenever he wanted, and transfer their little inheritance to a new peasant who would offer him a higher annuity.

240

The condition of the peasants, having thus lost the support of an ancient custom, and having become precarious, has not stopped getting worse and worse. Their imminent ruin was hastened by the fatal introduction of the potato cultivation, which offered the poor a food substance being much more abundant and much less expensive than wheat, and which by now has been ranking bread among the superfluities of life, to which the poor and unhappy worker must no longer have an aspiration for; it all having been further accelerated by the spoliation of the Catholic clergy, and the necessity in which it had been placed to start living on its only occasional functions. Weddings, births, and deaths, now formed the main revenue of the priest; it is in his interest that all his young parishioners marry, and he exerts all his influence toward this direction, perhaps without even fully realizing it. He is at least sure that in no country does one see more early marriages than in Ireland. The ruin of the poor was further accelerated by the semi-savage habits that the peasants had preserved. They knew neither the luxury of nice clothing and houses, nor elegance, nor even cleanliness. It was enough for them to live in survival mode. They greedily seized all means to do so with ever more saving, but each saving on their sustenance was immediately followed by a savings on their wages, and thus they have slowly come to the last limits of what is necessary to keep one alive. In the course of these hundred and eighty years, it seems that the population of Ireland has at least quadrupled. But since quite recently, it has become so superior to the needs of industry that its creatures are seen competing for work with all the avarice of hunger; with human beings offer to give all their time, all their strength, all their skill, only to obtain living conditions that a swine would hardly live by(1).

(1) The rapid increase of the population is almost always a sign of distress, and not of prosperity. It indicates that the proletarian, unable to calculate his resources or those of his family, listens only to his crass appetites, without hope, or without fear of the future.

The effect of this stupefaction resulted in the people of Ireland experiencing a population increase unprecedented in the history of human kind.

241

Ireland's wealth and prosperity are said by some to have increased in equal step with its population; and the followers of chrematistics put up as proof: the ever-increasing number of vessels used in the trade of this island. But this trade is almost exclusively that of exporting foodstuffs, and while the Irish people are starving, each year we see in Irish ports a greater quantity of wheat and all kinds of grains, salted pork and butter. To stick to the first article only:

Limerick exported 102.593 'barrels' of wheat in 1822, and 218.915 in 1833,. (Inglis, Vol. I, p. 295)

Galway exported three times more wheat in 1834 than fifteen years earlier. (Ibid., Vol. II, p. 32)

Sligo; wheat exports have tripled there in the last three years. (Ibid., Vol. II, p. 123)

Londonderry; the progress of exports is also considerable. (Ibid., Vol. II, p. 200)

Belfast; the increase extended to all kinds of commerce equally. (Ibid., Vol. II, p. 253)

Waterford; exports have doubled in the past nine years. (Ibid., Vol. I, p. 61)

Cork; the export of salted pork is the only one that has increased. (Ibid., Vol. I, p. 189)

But it is a very false prosperity that is signified solely by the increase in export trade. More ships can be loaded with food each year from Ireland, because every year it becomes more impossible for the Irish peasant to taste wheat bread, or even the oat bread that his sweats have been giving birth to since the history of mankind, the butter he has prepared, the swine fed with his family's chosen food pieces that he had to withhold from his children.

We find in an English journal, The Examiner for August 7, 1836, the statistical results for three years as follows:

Total population, in Ireland by religion:

1766, 1,871,725	Catholics 1,326,860	Protestants 544,865
1822, 6,800,000	5,820,000	980,000
1834, 7,943,940	7,190,968	752,972

The proletarians all or almost all belong to the Catholic religion. In the last twelve years, the money given to assist emigration has almost entirely been distributed among the Protestant poor. Hence the reverse march of the two populations.

242

Ireland will only be truly prosperous when its consumption will increase as well as its production, as when its agriculture will feed all its children, whom will be properly clothed by its factories, instead of keeping only the waste products for itself, as is happening today.

A population that sleeps on straw, in huts and sheds, dresses in second-hand clothes shop, in the old clothes of England, who feeds on potatoes, gives in no way a boost to trades, manufactures, or agriculture. Its misery stops the progress of any industry intended to serve it, at the same time as it is being tormented, and a running danger for the rich people surrounding it. Its misery is at the same time the result of an injustice, a spoliation that has to be up to the legislator to repair. It should not be doubted that we are only asking for the peasants to get their rights restored; and not a returning to ancient feudal conditions when they needed to raise their swords, so as to become valuable to their Lord. But we do ask that we restore for them a certain ease, abundance, and the security in which their forefathers lived; that we protect them against the ruthless mutual competition among their fellow proletarians; and that we preserve for them forever that part of the harvests which they can no longer afford to buy now, but that must remain with them as a necessary cultural improvement.

Two things are needed to get them out of the state in which they are at; and to prevent appalling misfortunes, which their despair can attract to the whole empire.

Ireland must be delivered from its overabundant population, either through emigration, or by the cultivation of its districts' barrens. It then becomes necessary to involve the countryside population, those who will remain working the soil, by granting them the ownership of this ground, as it is in all prosperous countries. We must activate, as it was before, the right of perpetuity, so that all the lands' improvements that are patiently and with perseverance made, will give an added value to the smallhold; henceforth, a benefit to itself, instead of have it function as is, only to see its condition worsen as time goes on.

243

Not only does Ireland's current population infinitely exceed the amount of labor Ireland can employ, this population is still increasing with the most alarming rapidity. In their state of misery, the Irish know no other type of enjoyment than the pleasures of the senses; they neither calculate nor think of the future; in both sexes, almost all of them marry before the age of twenty, and one has been led to believe that the population of the island is increasing by three hundred thousand individuals per year. Thus any partial measure which would provide only for the fate of three hundred thousand individuals per year, however considerable that number may be, would not correct anything, it would instead only maintain the current state of affairs.

It is therefore necessary to act simultaneously on the largest feasible scale. Emigration and interior reclamation must be implemented simultaneously to deliver Ireland from the excess of its population; and the temporary use of a mass of workers to reclaim land may give time to wait for the slower effects of emigration. England still has a huge expanse of countries to colonize; of these possessions, Canada alone could receive, not only the excess, but the entire population of the three kingdoms, and the arrival of Irish settlers would only increase the prosperity of these vast regions, and

tie them more to the country of origin. Distance from Ireland to lands that are situated to the north of the St. Lawrence is not very large, and these grounds are watered by so many rivers that interior navigation can carry the emigrants, even to the remotest points, with less costs than to any other colony. The further north they go, the more they will find healthy air and virgin soil. There is no reason why the vast lands surrounding Hudson Bay are not one day as populated and as cultivated as those which, in a similar climate, surround the Gulf of Finland.

Let one beware of neglecting such immense natural resources, the Irish population, accustomed as they are to the most extreme privations, could be colonizing countries where the English population would perish misery and boredom. There is not, in all this region, a

244

site where the Irish peasant, who would be given ten acres of land free from rent, would raise a cabin better than the one he would have left, and not firstly get his potatoes and his pig who would be all his, and soon a more abundant food too, and the pleasures he could not even dream of today.

But it should be remembered, however, that an emigration en masse demands considerable preliminary work. Emigrants must be transported with their families, not just to Quebec, but to the very region where he is to be settled. You have to supply this Irishman, absolutely naked when you take him out of his cabin, with a little assortment, however limited, of clothes, tools, furniture, seeds; he must finally be transported to the ground that we present to him as a property, in time for him to clear it, seed it, and feed it until it reaches the next harvest time. We can hardly estimate less than fifty or sixty pound sterling per family for these first advances. True enough, once done, the further existence of this family can be considered as assured; and with it, the motherland will have acquired citizens in its true meaning.

It is not in this way that emigrations and recent colonizations have been carried out; it was primarily intended to introduce large organizations, as developed in the home country, in new countries. But such organizations may well not only be unsuitable on their own, above all they are likely to be unfavorable to early developments. One wanted to start with advancing large capital and the establishment of large farms, and it was expected that their products would then be collected by trade, to be transported and next consumed in faraway countries, but it has almost always been a failure. Capitalists are accustomed to the kinds pleasures which cannot be found in the colonies; the more recent the speculation and the more is being asked for prompt and considerable returns, that agriculture just cannot comply with. While they soon clutter up those markets they wanted to supply, they don't do anything for the prosperity of the colony of origin, which would only increase by consumption, not by export; before long they are disgusted,

go away, and their work is abandoned. It's still worse if the capitalists are associated with companies; so, after having created a staff of agents, and having established thought to be lucrative places, they can only think of withdrawing their capital, sell their shares, and profit not from a progress of colonization, but off the credulity of the to be fooled.

It is by a very diverse behaviors that the nascent nations prospered; most founders though, only thought of themselves, of their own needs, of their own consumption, and not to trade. It was enough for them to conquer the resistance of a virgin nature and the inconstancy of the seasons, without submitting yet again to the chances of the markets. They demanded from the soil just what they needed to live, and they have lived indeed; each development of their industry has provided, not articles for export, but new pleasures and new objects of consumption.

On the other hand, they know they must limit their enjoyments to what their own hands can produce, so as to not seek outside markets, and not be thinking of exchanges, but letting them always be proportionate to the wheat being sowed, and the other foods produced, that their growing families can consume. They have to build their own cabins, weave their clothes, make their tools; and if we are then asked what will be the use of a colony that produces nothing but what it consumes, not exporting and not buying anything, we will answer that it is fulfilling its role when it is producing happy people. Thus began all the colonies of the Greeks in Asia Minor and Italy, this is how all the small peoples of antiquity developed; while modern colonies, designed in a mercantile spirit, in calculating the prompt returns of invested capital, almost all experienced cruel trials and tribulations, and only began to prosper, like Canada and New England, when the capitalists stopped speculating on them.

No doubt that in an advanced state of civilization,

large amounts of capital spent on agriculture are rapidly increasing its products; often they increase them without proportion to market demand; but in general the capital intended for the land must be delivered to it in perpetuity. There never has been a way to withdraw them without loss, and so isn't a project suiting commercial wealth speculators. Real land or territorial improvement is completed only by the one who dedicates the source of all capital wealth to it; his work that establishes its value for him and for his own perpetual pleasures. It doesn't matter in the least on some immediate return, but on him contemplating a long future for himself and for his family. This activity takes place for instance by means of planting of trees, whose life will be time-honored; by taming wild animals, which improves the species, in view of the benefits that will be derived from them and their offspring; by carrying out various waterworks, of which posterity will reap the most benefits of. Agriculture must always be practiced from the perspective of perpetuity; which as territorial wealth distinguishes it from the commercial wealth of all other industries.

Whatever the immense extent of the countries subject to colonization, and therewith the happiness that a poor population, accustomed to work as well as to deprivation, could hope for; one should not expect that on its own, emigration is enough to relieve Ireland's miseries. Perhaps a third of the population of this superabundant island, when this is compared to the demand for work, at the wage that can be offered to him. A means of fair living for more than two million people is required, and one does not calculate without awe and apprehension how many vessels it would take to transport them, and what stores of provisions it would take, to establish them in a new country. Moreover, it must be remembered that the more substantial an enterprise like that is, the more it will generate confusion, disorder, and squandering. The greater the number of settlers, the more, if unforeseen obstacles upset them, their misery becomes excessive. This great emigration must relentlessly be pursued, because it is by this means that the most happiness and future stability can be assured to a people that has suffered so much; but we must never hope that emigration alone is the

247

answer to provide relief in Ireland to those who have been suffering from hunger and deprivation for so long.

Fortunately Ireland contains within its boundaries a vast extent of land yet to be developed, which will require immediate work that is considerable enough to usefully occupy, for many years to come, all the excess of its population. The most important of these lands are those called the 'bogs', the quagmires. They are vast spaces, or rather whole provinces, not really swamps, but bottomless mud. The bogs are covered with thick dark brown grass, interspersed from place to place with areas of dried peat. In fact, they usually turn into peat lands. Men or horses who have the recklessness of intruding it would sink in and soon disappear as in quicksand. Some kind of fermentation sometimes seems to be going on in these black muds; which then rise up, and pour themselves like torrents of lava over the surrounding countryside. The largest and most famous of these quagmires is the 'Allen bog', which covers much of central Ireland, and which alone occupies several million acres.

(On the Allen bog, see: Inglis, vol. I, p. 105; on those of Joyce country, vol. II, p. 44; and those of Cunemara, vol. II, p. 55, 64, etc.)

Whatever the desolation and the present sterility of these quagmires, it is known that not only can they be made suitable for cultivation, but even converted into land of the highest fertility. The details of this agricultural operation; for which lime is mainly used, then followed with marine debris of all sorts, are beyond the scope of this Essay; it is enough for us to note that the means to do so is yesterday's knowledge throughout Ireland, and that the materials are everywhere at hand, that only labor, something so desirable to create a demand for; and finally, that the clearing of the bogs, which returns them forever to cultivation and sanitation, costs on average about seven pounds sterling, per acre. Thus by comprising the ten-acre heirloom per family, each would cost about seventy pounds sterling; the inheritance would be

granted in property against a perpetual annuity of five pounds sterling, or ten shillings per acre; at which price it would be covering not only the interest on advanced capital, but administration costs and a profit as well. On these fertile grounds however, the new owners would live in ease, they would improve their condition each year, and the motherland would have gained the value of a new province, inhabited by perhaps three hundred thousand happy peasant families.

Emigration and colonization projects in Canada, as well as domestically to be cultivated peat bogs demand the advancement of considerable capital; a capital however, that would not be lower than what England has already spent in withdrawing the odious oppression of another class of its subjects, the negroes in the colonies, and these were hardly more unhappy than the Irish. We could, true enough, consider the advance which would need to be made to the latter not as money spent but as money invested. We earlier assumed that full ownership of the Irish bogs would perpetually be ceded for a rent of ten shillings per acre, after they are returned to fertility; but it would neither be fair nor prudent not to charge the colonists transported to Canada with rent, after all they did not cost the mother country less. In fact it is inconceivable how their industry, which would suffice them to live, would bring them no money.

A loan to put the bogs into cultivation, which England should guarantee, will always be a huge sacrifice that Ireland would be owing to British generosity. If the sovereign authority indeed grants it, it will have the right to say to the Irish lords: "You have, by your cupidity and your lack of foresight, reduced men dependent on you, and of whose existence you were to be the protectors, to a state of suffering that shamed our laws, and which we could not maintain by force without being criminally involved. You endangered the entire British Empire, pushing over a quarter of its population towards a distress which, if we had not intervened, could only end in rebellion. You have shaken the foundations but we will certainly not recognize such right, and we won't give you the power to drag us into it a

second time. The original property right is that of the farmer to live on the fruit of his labor, and it is that which you have violated; we henceforth will intervene without fear, without scruple, to guarantee this law in its entirety. We will demand that on the rich soil of Ireland, in the midst of all the bounties of its vegetation, the Irish peasant lives at least as well as the peasant on the sands of Prussia, or under the icy climates of Russia; that he in no way be inferior to those peasants as far as housing, clothing, food, or heating, is concerned; and that he has as much rest and as much security for the future as any peasant. It will only be after having assured him of his part, that we will recognize your right to what's left, and that we will take care to guarantee too."

So what are the guarantees necessary for the grower, for his happiness and for national prosperity? Those are the very same ones that all peoples felt

were necessary for the industry which nourishes them, in a recognition of the existence of land ownership. They had a feeling that there was a way to conduct proper agriculture, an agriculture that was always improving and that was made from the perspective of a distant posterity; and they wanted that the one who had taught the earth to bear fruit, could consider it as belonging to him be in perpetuity. It is essential for the good of all, that the farmer knows well that he does not have to guess with his land; that all the improvements that he entrusts to the soil, at whatever distance in the future, will be returned to him to be enjoyed and will not be lost to him nor to his posterity. Real agricultural improvements, those which are the basis of a country's prosperity, are time-honored; Egypt still enjoys the improvement works that were done before the Roman conquest; land irrigation in several districts of Persia, India and China, all owe their fertility due to ancient works, the date of which is lost in the mists of time; the dikes that contain the

250

largest just like the smallest rivers in Italy, those that created the polders of Holland, have been existing for centuries; the kingdom of Valencia still owes the perfection of its agriculture today, due to the Arabs; and the land of the Irish bogs, many plots of which have already been restored to fertility by the lonely industry of a poor peasant, will retain its solidity for centuries to come, if not until the end of time. Those of these agricultural works like dikes, irrigation, dewatering, which became historic, were often undertaken by communal power, and sometimes by big capitalists; but the gradual, insensible betterment which contributed the most to giving the earth a new face, is that which has been operated in isolation, by constant, intelligent work, done with love, almost unselfishly, of the disregarded cultivator.

It was he who discovered how to create an outflow, and thus draining a swamp, who planted trees living for centuries, who tamed wild animals, who perfected the species of fruit trees, a work that requires several centuries, who found for each type of land the plant of greatest value, the culture that best suited it, and the crop rotation which retained the most fertility of the soil.

The feeling of ownership alone has bound the farmer to the land. It made him study all the modifications so he could gain the most; and, in view of his children making its work gratifying. Indeed ownership in perpetuity has been the greatest source of man's enjoyments, and at the same time the greatest cause of the prosperity of the human species.

The most desirable state of society is one where the great mass of farmers owns it. It is not the one which generates the greatest net revenue, and thus the greatest profit, but the one which produced the greatest mass of gross revenue, the one that employs the greatest number of people, and rewards it widely. It is the state of society that, while growing, maintains a happy population, as, without happiness increasing, the increase of a population is only a calamity; while on the other hand, it is also the state of society that puts the most certain obstacle to a disorderly growth in population.

The small owner, who knows that his family can live honestly on his small heritage, is no more inclined than the count or the marquis to willfully let that heritage deteriorate. He is no more inclined than his Lord to marry young; nor to marry all his children, if he has not insured for himself that they will be able to support themselves in his rank and honor of his family. In fact, the peasant owners acquire the virtues, prudence, love of order and the stability of an aristocracy; while the mediocrity of their patrimony prevents them from acquiring aristocracy's vices, from giving themselves over to the intoxication of pleasures or to a dissipation of wealth. If we compare the number of peasants with ownership in their land in each of the different nations of Europe, we would find not only the measure of happiness in general most widespread, but also that of a population's firm attachment to the established order, and the basic elements of government stability.

There is no country where one meets fewer owner cultivators than in the three British kingdoms. The seignury, which was properly only a political power, has been transformed by rights into a landed property there; while everywhere else, property has become ever more independent from the seignury with each generation. The feudal maxim, 'no land without a lord', was denied in France by many facts; but in England it has become the law. In France, tenants in common had continued to be subjected to many expensive services, but their perpetual rights to land has never been discredited. In England, expensive services or humiliating experiences had been abolished early; but the tenant, by agreeing to periodically arrange new conditions with his master, by promising money instead of services, had made himself an object in his market. From villain he had become a farmer, and he thought he had gained a great deal; and maybe he did win in fact, because for a while the big farmers of England formed an opulent, intelligent and respected class. However the farmer had lost the perpetuity, and nothing can compensate for this loss. But during the last war, the disproportionate rise in the price of food made English farmers feel the passions and the chances of trading; then, with peace, the drop in the price of these same products almost ruined them all.

England itself begins to feel that it had entered a wrong path in putting in opposition the interests of the three classes of men: the landowners, the farmers, and the day laborers, who contribute to the culture. In Ireland, this same system only produced suffering and oppression. The first thing to do for this unhappy country is to assimilate the condition of the peasant to that of the owner as much as possible, by opening up the way for his economies to put him in a condition of effectively becoming an owner. Irish peasants are no doubt far away today, to have the means to buy and pay for the land on which they are starving. Still, one should refrain from engaging in ripping them off their small capital, and preclude the very possibility altogether; but instead let them keep it to improve their little

heritage. But rather than paying for the land with capital, it can also be bought through a perpetual annuity; and have its keeper, whose annual canon is invariable, be transmitting the fund to his children as a lasting posterity, that is as real to an owner as it is to his lord. The farmer who has a lease of fourteen, or twenty-one years, has an interest; in that at the end of this lease the land is not in a better condition than when he received it. Not only would all the capital which he attached to the earth to last for a longer term be lost to him; these would be turned against him by a master, as a lease renewal would only happen on more expensive terms. Mr. Inglis noticed that such was constantly being practiced in Ireland, and that the farmer who for twenty-one years, had been making significant capital improvements to the land, ruined them all at the end of its lease (vol. II, ch. 7, p. 113).

The fund keeper in perpetuity works, on the contrary, for his children and grandchildren, for an endless future. He feels for his estate all the love of an owner, he does not only think of the annual fruits he can derive from it, he wants to adorn it, sanitize it, make it more convenient; and he does in no way account for

253

every hour that he misses sleep or rest when it comes to planting a tree, as long as it will be his children who will reap its fruits. His relationship with his lord being on fixed terms forever, there is no longer any dispute nor any jealousy between them; he sees him only as a protector, and the land he holds from him is their bond, and no subject of quarrel.

This is not to attempt an incredible mind game as to how things should be, nor is it going to exceed the power that has been exercised by legislatures in many other countries, other than to oblige the Irish lords to grant their land to their farmers for a perpetual rent. On the contrary, it is to return to the ancient habits of all peoples who have favored agriculture; it is taking advantage of the example of all civilizations. The emphyteutic lease, the lease intended to encourage the planting of trees, by ensuring the planter the perpetuity of the enjoyment, probably came from the Greeks, as its name ‘ἐμψυτεύτικη’ indicates. It was transmitted to us through Roman legislation, and later it became imbued with feudalism. Letters of rent, abbreviations, are just various forms of the nature of this kind of property, in use in the various provinces of France, of Switzerland and the Savoy. The ‘livelli’ in Italy are no different than perpetual land rents. Pierre-Léopold, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, obliged all ecclesiastical bodies in its states, all the hospitals, all the pious foundations, to alienate all their land holdings for a perpetual rent, redeemable at any time at the rate of three percent. This vigorous measure raised to the highest prosperity the large class of ‘contadini livellari’ or owners of sealed-cap leases, that it created; while reestablishing order in the function of public foundations, and sheltered them from the dilapidations which would have ruined them. Furthermore, the alienation against a perpetual annuity no longer is an unknown concept in Ireland, either. Mr. Inglis having entered Connaught, the wildest part of this island, was struck with “Balinasloe”, with an air of

unusual ease. Balinasloe, he said, is a city remarkable for its cleanliness, and the traveler

254

recognizes at first glance that it is not left to chance, but that a protective hand is extended over it.... Lord Clancarty is Lord of Balinasloe, and all kinds of improvement are encouraged by him. Nothing that we know of, moreover, is likely to be a more effective impetus toward improving the country, than Lord Clancarty's practice of having granted concessions in perpetuity against a fixed annuity to all those who build good houses..... Lord Clancarty always estimates a fair price for the land he offers to the farm, and he refuses to stipulate a larger rent, although competition could easily raise it to double the value that he asks. (Inglis, vol. II, ch. 2, p. 16 and 17).

Further, in the same county, the riant and prosperous town of Clifden was founded by Mr. d'Arcy, without a cost to land, only by granting the land to anyone who wanted to build, against a perpetual rent of six shillings per acre; that was all the land was worth then, but the city and port charged a higher value to the rest of the region, later (Inglis, vol. II, ch. 5, p. 74).

Finally the province of Ulster owes in part the prosperity that distinguishes it from the rest of Ireland in that the properties confiscated there were let go to companies in London, who in turn ceded them to peasants against perpetual rents (Ibid. vol. II, ch. 12. p. 220). County Antrim, situated in this province, is the only one where there are real peasants. They enjoy the fruits of the industry of their fathers, for they acquired their land for a perpetual royalty. (Ibid. vol. II, ch. 13, p. 243).

A foreigner would be accused, no doubt, of a ridiculous presumption if he tried to designate the means of execution by which a legislature could determine the fate of the agricultural class, as to giving it a perpetual right to the land it cultivates, so we will content ourselves with presenting here some general considerations on this necessary intervention of the supreme authority between opposing interests, and on the goal it should achieve. For agriculture to prosper in a country, for land to be cultivated with love and intelligence, it is necessary

255

that two classes of people perpetually exercise rights over it. On the one hand, the enlightened rich who study, improve and spread around them a penchant for discoveries and improvements; on the other hand, the men of labor, who observe nature more closely, and who, in general, attached to ancient uses, enhance them through patience and economy, and defend them against a too active spirit of innovation. These two classes of farmers are also essential to a national prosperity. The second was destroyed in Ireland by the usurpations of the nobility. If an imprudent ardor of reform led to the destruction of the first, and this is the fate with which Ireland is threatened in the case of an insurrection of the poor against the rich, the consequences would not be less fatal. Legislation must tend to maintain a

balance between these two classes; it must encourage large landowners, who operate their estates with their own hands. The Irish aristocracy could well be far too numerous, if we judge it by the number of beautiful lands that we encountered, almost at every step, and by the multitude of opulent emigrants, 'of absentee' owners, who reside in England and the Continent. No matter that Ireland itself freely chooses among its domains, all those who would want to argue for its own influence, it is not up to their regard whether the legislature must intervene or not.

But the law must not recognize any contract which deprives the land of the perspective, the intelligence, and the affection of a master. It must say to those in charge: "where you cannot be master yourself, get replaced only by those who, for the good of society, will regard themselves as masters; by those to whom you will assure a perpetual right to the land that you will entrust them. It is the specific duty of the legislator, not to withdraw the part of the human race which is subjected to him in a state of abject poverty and stultification into which it has fallen; just as much as it is his duty to save the rich from a terrible insurrection, and the entire empire of a terrible civil war. It's his duty to finally remove for ever, the fate of Ireland from the crazy labor auction that disposes of it, from the fight between the

256

poor, who, in order to obtain work, is forced to be content with less than the most miserable subsistence, and the rich, who, by blind greed, wanting to seize everything, is exposing himself as well as the country to losing everything. Lawmakers must not, cannot leave a whole class of cultivators exposed to the double hazard of the vices of their lords and of their own, any longer; they must not allow a whole country to be unhappy, regardless of industry, the sobriety and the virtues of its inhabitants, only because a Lord Limerick or a Lord Clifden deciding how their revenue is extracted. There are no doubt lordships whose masters deserve recognition and admiration; but even there, the law owes a guarantee of a future; it must preserve the peasants from the effects of recklessness, ruin, vices, or the absence of fair-minded descendants of the best masters. A lot of otherwise intelligent lords, and of an honorable character, refuse to grant leases of any kind to their cultivators; they want to keep them in absolute political dependence. Perhaps today, it may well be that they only think in terms of doing their peasants a favor, but who can answer for their heirs, or perhaps creditors who will seize their own property, or those next in line buying it? The peasant owner, whether he has disbursed a capital or is bound only to a perpetual rent, depends only on himself; the bankruptcy of the one to whom he pays his rent, his harshness or his lavishness barely matters to him. He won't be ruined by his absence, or oppressed by the partiality of his agents.

Convinced that the alienation of land, set as of then in terms of existing farms against a perpetual annuity, is the only chance of salvation for the rich as well as to the poor of Ireland, we also believe that the price at which this alienation must be done can only be set by public authority;

for it must be established lower, much lower than the sellers ask for, and what the buyers offer. As we said before, the cultivator's right is to be completely maintained by his work, like a worthy human creature; and, it is only the surplus, or the profit, which can form the legitimate price of the rent or annuity. But in the abject state to which the Irish peasant

257

has been reduced, he eagerly offers his work, on the condition of obtaining only the food and treatment accorded to that of domestic animals. If he does not promise to work for those minimal wages, there will only be a few generous masters who won't accept the exaggerated rents that are on offer; and that others, out of prudence alone, refuse to stipulate a contract that they know cannot be performed in decent circumstances. There are therefore masters that are fair enough or wise enough not to reduce their peasants to begging; but there are none that leave them the ease with which industrious British subjects would be entitled. It is therefore not only unnecessary but would also be misleading to calculate what may be the net product of the land, after having kept the unhappy poor in the state of scarcity in which the Irish live; but what will remain after maintaining the number of men needed to work it, in the condition in which working men and their families must live. It is necessary that they are housed, clothed, fed, and kept at a comfortable temperature, like proper peasants must be; that, in the main, bread and not potato, be their essential food; that from time to time they can afford meat, and some fermented drink. What will remain after this modification will be the only annuity that is legitimate; the invariable and perpetual annuity at which price the property must be transferred.

The goal we must set ourselves, as we have said many times, it is to give the land to owner cultivators, and not to contractors who have the work performed by a more miserable stock of day laborers. The extent of new inheritances must therefore be proportioned to the strength of a family. Its head, with his wife and children, may suffice to make all the agreements, for among small landowners, women and children work from an early age, under the eyes and direction of the father; while the day laborer's children cannot find a wage, and their mother must stay at home to keep an eye on them, the work of the little peasant next to his father is an education, an occupation, and a pleasure for him. If the day laborer's children, on the contrary, are

258

called to do some work, their flock usually is a school of immorality; the idleness to which we have reduced the Irish wives and children, excluding them everywhere from productivity, is thus one of the great causes of the misery of the island. It is also necessary that the extent of the smallholding is such that the family, being industrious, finds itself constantly occupied therein. This is indeed one of the advantages of a system of cultivation by its owners, that the creation of a very wide variety of products, by means

of a fairly limited area to do it in, there is not a day in the year for which the intelligent cultivator cannot find a suitable occupation. In the system of large farms, on the contrary, the farmer thinks not of what he can consume himself, but of what he can take to the market for obtaining money, with which he will pay for his farm. One single type of product suits him better than several; say, he sells grain and nothing else; but it follows that all its grain is sown, and is harvested at the same time. In these two months, spread apart, he takes in workers at a very high price; condemning them to idleness and begging, as he abandons them during the ten other months of the year, is not his business. But it is very much the affair of the nation; it is the second great cause of the misery of Ireland. The population required for sowing and the harvest remains idle for half to three quarters of the year (Inglis, vol. II, ch. 16, p. 299). For an intelligent farmer, who does everything by himself, up to making his tools, which threshes his wheat under cover, there is no dead season, even in Switzerland and Germany, where the climate is harsher than in England. The apparent domestic products of large farms, in the latter country, are a deception; for the farmer has not taken into account the wages of certain workers whom he dismisses for nine months of the year. True enough, he does not pay them himself, but society must somehow defray them, to keep those workers alive so they remain available for the next season. The goal to strive for in Ireland is that every farmer-owner will be doing his own work; that he borrows, if he wants, days of work from his neighbor, but

259

that he returns them in kind; that he got used to, as all agricultural writers taught him, and as good nature made it easy to follow up on, to finding useful work for every season, for every day of the year.

While commissioners appointed by Parliament will need to set the average rent for each type of land, in each county they will still have estimate how much land a family can cultivate, and cultivate well, without resorting to any aid from exports. This will be the measure that the farms granted at the price of a perpetual rent.

We only have one more observation to make; being convinced that among a people whose customs would have been developed from a distribution of property such as the one that we are proposing, all the families of farmer-owners would have formed such a sense of dignity, such a reluctance to place their children in a condition inferior to theirs, that their prudence could be well trusted to avoid early marriages and too large families.

We see in fact that in all countries where peasants are owners, the number of smallholdings is always nearly the same; their extent varies very little; the head of the family knows very well that by dividing them he would destroy the balance of culture which makes him able to find employment for every day of the year, and provide at the same time all the objects his family needs for his consumption. He only marries just one of his sons, unless the second one finds employment in any industrial trade, who then receives his portion of his heritage in money. The army, navy, and church, employ the others. It is also in money, and by his savings, that he pays his

daughters' portion. He knows that a big family would be embarrassing to him, not only at the time of the birth of his children, but throughout their life, and that is for him a salutary warning. Also the population of truly agricultural countries does not increase significantly, it does not increase more than its resources. But the customs of a people are the effect of long habits and long reflections; they do not change when the legislation

260

changes. We attributed the cause of the current distress in Ireland to a revolution in property, it all started one hundred and eighty years ago, and we have shown that several of its consequences have only since recently begun to develop. Likewise, the new revolution in property, which has become inevitable, but which we would like to soften and regularize, will change the mores of Ireland only in the long run. Today the Irishman is so miserable that the future is the farthest thing from his mind, so he never worries about number of children he can have. He gets married before the age of twenty, without holding an inch of earth in his name, possessing no furniture, and without having a shilling in his purse; he offers a landowner an exorbitant price to farm his land, and one that he will never be able to pay, for a small hut and a patch of land. He lives in rags and in the mud, with his wife and the children who get born every year. When he thinks he has done a lot he satisfies their hunger with potatoes, and he does not look beyond. It will be many years before the Irishman understands that such a state of misery and lack of foresight is degrading; before he contemplates it with the horror it deserves; before he will feel that it is foolish and even criminal to marry, as long as he cannot ensure a proper existence for his wife and children. We must therefore strongly promote by legislation the formation of new mores; at least for a while the smallholdings must be indivisible, that the keeper would even be liable to lose them if he tried to subdivide them. We must increase obstacles to reckless and precocious marriages, by strengthening paternal authority and that of the family council, to prevent them. Bans must be published and delays must be set, requiring a long wait. Finally, we should perhaps require that spouses have some guarantee; some money is saved on deposit in a bank or the parish scholarship fund, intended for children to come. The present improvidence of the Irish must be combated by all means that can be reconciled with public liberty, and perhaps the most effective would be habits, or the local customs, which decries shortsightedness.

261

The Swiss peasant's daughter would think herself dishonored if, by marrying, she did not bring her husband a double bed and a walnut wardrobe with its complete trousseau; composed of all the linen which she will need for the rest of her life. For his part, a husband would not go to church for the ceremony, if he was not wearing the new and complete militia uniform. The tenacious work, and extended savings, necessary to conform to the honored village decorum, have prevented or delayed more

imprudent marriages than all the exhortations of wise men and parents. Let the notables of each locality act together to introduce such customs to the Irish, or to strengthen those that already exist there; and the peasant, once knowing the ease, and security of having a future, will also acquire a sense of his dignity; he will know how to maintain it by his own prudence, and the calamities which desolate this beautiful country will have come to an end.

262

EIGHTH ESSAY

Effects of Slavery on Humanity.

We have said it, and we will keep repeating it, the prosperity of a nation cannot be measured by mass of wealth accumulated in its territory; such measuring must only be done according to the amount of happiness that this wealth distributes among those who make up the nation. The real goal of political economy is to ensure a distribution of wealth, such that all benefit from the advantage of wealth development. And even though some are more favored than others, it is still necessary that all have a share in the physical and moral enjoyments, that wealth can provide. As the nation grows richer, all must be better nourished, better dressed, better housed; that all have more security in their existence, more hopes in their future, and in at the same time more moderation in their desires. It is necessary that everyone can call on increased leisure time for the development of their intelligence, just as much as for the relaxation of their tired limbs, and the maintenance of their health in general. And finally, all must find, in their participation in the growing wealth, a new motive for mutual benevolence, and not a fervour to more expressed enmities. But the increase in national wealth must also confer, to the richest only, benefits that are only for them; of which the others however, will yet benefit indirectly. There must be rich people in the nation who can devote themselves exclusively to the pursuit of the

263

highest possible success to the efforts of the human race. They must be able to cultivate, without being distracted by pecuniary limitations, their intelligence, their imagination, their sensitivity. And, they should be scattered over the entire surface of the country, to enlighten citizens all over; so that their special progress in reason, science, fine arts, morality and universal benevolence, can benefit everyone. Exposing this great goal of social science also serves us well to conclude that the institution of slavery is an absurdity, unjust and inhuman. Human society was founded for the common advantage; and we abandon the first of its principles when we sacrifice one half of this society to serve the

other, when we set aside all the goods for some and all evils for others. As soon as we allow ourselves to consider wealth to be a meaningful entity in itself, and not in its rapport with the number of those who participate in its advantages, we are almost automatically conditioned to look at wealth as a quantity which can well increase by the privations and sufferings of those whom it is intended to make happy; because it dulls one's inner voice, and one gets lost in the pursuit of a goal directly opposed to that which one yet feels to be self evident. We cease, in fact, to be able to distinguish a wealth which is acquired by a society, from that which is acquired at the expense of a society; we put in the same category what man won over nature and what man won from man; we count as progress all the savings made on production, even when these savings are only so much taken away from men who are members of the same society. However, when it comes to summing up the wealth of society before and after the alleged cost savings of production, we find it diminished and not augmented; because this kind of economy has ruined revenue of the poor to a much greater extent than it has enriched the rich; it added something to the economy's net proceeds

264

in favor of the latter, but it reduced the gross product much more from the quantity used to be distributed among the former. It therefore destroyed the very wealth that the whole doctrine of the chrematistic school tended as proven to have increased.

As soon as we confuse the progress of the fortunes of the rich with that of national wealth, as soon as we believe that the former are well allowed to enrich themselves more and more by saving on labor or on the wages they disburse, the poor have already been sacrificed in their hearts, or at least in their minds. And accordingly, we just have to choose between the means to make them consume as little as possible, so that they will reduce the net product as little as possible. There are three main possibilities: the first is to render their cooperation valueless, either by replacing them outright with powers shown to work through mechanical technology, or by asking nature only for the fruits it produces with the least of human labor. In parts of Scotland for instance, workers became superfluous and subsequently were deported. The second is to engage them in work under the principle of competition; to work for the smallest remuneration that will suffice in keeping them alive: that's what was done to them in Ireland. The third is, not to leave them any choice whatsoever, but, by violence and using the whip, to make them work so hard that barely any vigor remains sustained in them: this is the slavery of the West Indies. Each of these expedients, while invented, could not be continued; because they were in conflict with the underlying first principle of an existing society, as being the utility of wealth in terms of the happiness of all. Instead of making everyone enjoy, for the benefit of all, some were far better treated than the others; only these few mattered, and the power over all others was entrusted to them. Society allowed them to be wealthy, while the great majority has to be satisfied with the meager pittance. But the cupidity of the rich betrayed them; because, in the admirable dispensation of Providence, the rich have

a need for the poor at least as much as the poor need the rich. Whoever thought he could do without men and his industry to produce, had to wise up to the fact that he could not do without men

265

to consume the fruits of his industry. The one who reduced the working poor to dying from hunger, neither found himself rich enough to assist the worker with his alms, whom he had not let earn his bread in the first place, nor to defend himself against their resentments when hunger provokes them. The one who believed he could deprive his workers, with his own freedom, intelligence and will, fed a ferocious beast near him; whose work is no longer worth sustenance, but whose thirst for revenge is very capable to make people tremble. In the previous Essays we sought to make people understand the fatal consequences of systems which, without entirely depriving the poor of their freedom, nevertheless pit them against the rich, and do not in the least guarantee the former anything against too powerful an opponent. It is also important to us to make known the consequences of the system of slavery, a system that is cruder, more barbaric, and even more fatal in its effects, but which nevertheless is only the application of the same principle, "that States get richer either by producing more or by spending less; that they enrich themselves with every savings that they can make on the workforce; they get rich by extracting as much work from workers as possible for the least possible wages." That is to say: from the false doctrine that it is not man and the happiness of man, which the government must strive to increase, but wealth by itself; and the even more false consequence of this doctrine, that wealth is not the benefit to all, but the net profit achieved by a few.

In order to understand the consequences of slavery for the masters, for the slaves, for the entire human race, we believe, before indicating the means of delivering a society of this scourge, having to present here an analysis of Mr. Comte's excellent book on Domestic Slavery. We regard it, in fact, as the most complete treatise, the most learned, the most philosophical that has ever been written on slavery and its disastrous effects (1).

(1) This is the fifth book of the Treaties of Legislation by Mr. Comte, lawyer at the royal court. Paris 1827. This subject all by itself fills the fourth volume containing 536 pages.

266

Without a doubt humanity has found itself in receipt of more than one philosopher's eloquent pleas against this institution so outrageous for our species; but until now the slave masters, by heaping scorn on them, believed to be able to convince public opinion otherwise, or even if they allowed themselves to admire them without consequences, because, they said, the writers did not know all the facts, because the most beautiful theories are found, in practice, to be unworkable. Here, on the contrary, these are the facts as they are presented to us, the facts of all periods in time, facts from all parts of the world; and they have been attained with a

precision, with an exactitude, with an authenticity, which does not leave the shadow of a doubt on their agreement, and the conclusions to be drawn from it.

Slavery is so far from mores, habits, and even memories of France. So that many people will look on a treatise on the dire consequences of slavery in the same eye as a treatise on the errors of paganism. Moreover, they will believe that this book can concern only the legislation of some remote islands in America, as its object; and the fate of a people for which they feel no sympathy.

They have so often heard it said that the arrival of Christianity abolished slavery, that they do not pay attention that slavery was really abolished in England only in 1660, by the statute no. 12, ch. 24 of Charles II; in the rest of Western Europe, in the eighth century, and that in Eastern Europe it has never ceased. However, far from the cause of slavery abolition having been won, slavery not only has taken place, but it is still taking place right before our eyes; potentially forming a revolution which, by elevating vast countries where slavery has been instituted by law to the rank of powerful and civilized States, can assure the most frightful preponderance in the balance of the universe, of the countries ruled by possessors of men, over the countries where this possession is prohibited.

In Russia and Poland, the great mass of the population consists of slaves; it is the same prevalence in almost half of the Austrian states; and never, as much as today, do Russia, Poland and Austria weigh on Europe. Holland, France, maintain slavery in their colonies,

267

scattered in Asia, Africa and America; England has just abolished it; Spain and Portugal maintain slavery in what remains of their colonies. Ten, of the twenty-two United States of America maintain slavery, and these are the largest, as well as the most fortunately situated. All over English India, all over India dependent on England, slavery is legal, though without it being very common; and finally, in almost all the colossal republics of the formerly Spanish America, and in Brazil, slavery is still legal, although these new states have recently undertaken to abolish slavery, soon; which measures are constantly attacked or eluded by the prejudices or passions of its peoples. These, however, are all states that exemplify Christianity and the civilized world today! These are the states which dictate laws to others! Certainly, when the sovereign power is in the hands of so many slave owners, the time has not yet come to say that the cause of the abolition of slavery has been won. On the contrary, we must now more than ever collect facts, study them, give them publicity, to distract the regenerating nations from the continuation of such an abominable system. We will endeavor to present, in the least number of pages that we can, the chronological sequence of Mr. Comte's work, and we will almost always use his own expressions, even when, for the sake of brevity, we won't be indicating this by a reference or by quotation marks. Slavery, although preserved among some civilized nations, evidently had its origin in the abuse of victory in war among barbarians. The conquerors, instead of

slitting the throats of the vanquished, believed them to be human; and, above all, believed it to be expedient to keep them alive and making them work for them. Mr. Comte, as the title of his work indicates, undertook to examine what had been the result of this reckoning; what were the effects of slavery on the physical, intellectual and moral faculties of the masters, and also on those of slaves. He begins by recognizing

268

that the physical attributes of the masters are not damaged through slavery. Causes which seem to maintain physical strength are the availability of good food, sufficient exercise, and the choice of individuals who retain the master population. And the masters, in the state of barbarism as well as that of civilization, seem to combine all these advantages without problem. Their food is always assured; the habit, the taste for pleasure, the political situation, make them at least continue the exercises that are common for hunting and war; and finally, unless a national prejudice stops them, they can unite with the most beautiful among their slave women, and in having children more beautiful than their fathers. This is what made the Turks and Persians, who thus constantly improved their race.

But slavery must necessarily vitiate the physical condition of slaves. For these have no food, clothing, or habitation, except as much as it pleases the masters of leave them some. Any exercise that can give them strength, aptitude, skill, courage, is forbidden to them, as being dangerous for their owners. The small number of mechanical operations, which, in the interest of their masters, they are obliged to carry out, cannot but develop only a bit of their organism; a development also being very restrictive, because a forced exercise, that is excessive, accompanied by food deprivation, is a cause of weakness, much more than one of strength. And adding to those considerations that enslaved men can only have the less beautiful women for companions, the others becoming the concubines of the masters, and it will be easily understood why the enslaved part of mankind must have been deteriorating ever further.

But the extended development of man's physical aptitudes must above all be considered in terms of the means it gives to a man to act on things, and to make him fit to provide for his needs; slavery stops this development of an industry, not only in the slaves but in the masters as well. The first effect that slavery produced with regard to the masters is to

269

dispense work which immediately provides men with their livelihoods; the second is to make them see these works with contempt. In antiquity, only one industry was not degraded in the eyes of the masters: that of training, renting, buying, and selling men. One of the ancestors of Octavian had, it was said, dishonored his posterity by money lending; but Marcus Cato bought and sold men; he particularly sold old people who brought but a little profit, as they could soon become useless; and Cato was the guardian of morals (1)!

This contempt for all manual labor, which was called servile, was already universal among the Greeks and Romans; it is universal in the colonies, among the whole class of masters.

Even the European operative, branded as a criminal, when he becomes the owner of a man, immediately believes once doing so that he can no longer engage in productive work without derogating from his high status. The Dutch, who know so well to do and appreciate the kinds of useful work at home; displayed in Jakarta, as in the Cape of Good Hope, an insuperable contempt and aversion for any industrial occupation. The English at Saint Helena, Jamaica and all their other colonies; the Anglo-Americans in the ten southern states, likewise renounced any kind of work. In Hungary, Poland, and in Russia, masters never work; serfs only work on the land; among the Jews, already overwhelmed by contempt, we do not find any industry that is incurred by making oneself more useful. So although slavery does not necessarily vitiate the physical organisms of men who belong to the class of masters, it still has the effect of rendering it null and void in all kinds of occupations which are necessary for the existence of peoples. These are attributes that are not only useless to the human genre being considered en masse, but which do not serve the individual either; as it provides only evil which is produced for a multitude of others. If, by some great upheaval, the

(1) Plutarch, *Life of Marcus Cato*, p. 402.

270

class of masters suddenly disappeared from a country where slavery is allowed, there is no kind of work that would be remaining suspended, no wealth of which one had to deplore the loss.

Nothing would stop, except the tortures they inflict on their slaves. As much as industrial development is stopped among the masters by their contempt for work, so it is among the slaves through the brutishness to which their masters reduce them.

Slaves these days are incapable of any work that would require aptitude, intelligence, taste, care. It is probable that the leases of works of Roman antiquity were carried out by men trained in some industry while they were free, and whom the war had made slaves; because, as soon as the Romans, having conquered all the industrious peoples, could no longer make slaves except among the barbarians, all the arts, all kinds of industry, declined quickly at home, and they themselves fell back into barbarism.

Let us see then, with our author, what effect slavery produced on the intellectual faculties, that is to say of masters or slaves. (Chap. 4, p. 54). As for the masters, we must distinguish between them those who enjoy political freedom and those who are deprived of it. The former manage very well to develop those of their intellectual faculties which will serve them to act on their equals; while they will not develop those by which they could act on physical matter. The latter will not develop either one or the other. Man's laziness makes him prefer strength to reasoning, authority to persuasion, whenever he has the choice. But in antiquity the citizen of

the free States, unable to command his equals as he commanded his slaves, was forced to learn to persuade them. He therefore studied the man, his equal, on whom he was to act by persuasion; but he was not studying Nature, on which he could only act through the hands of his slaves. It seemed to him useless to find the means of saving them from a little fatigue; so also, all the applications of the science of industry seemed to him a derogation.

271

When the citizen lost his political freedom, he no longer had any interest in studying man; like he had no more than before, in studying Nature. Giving up aimless work, all knowledge died out, and thus the return of barbarism was the result.

Among the colonies of Europeans, those of the English are the only ones where colonists obtained some political power from the mother country; they are also the only ones where they felt the need for an intellectual development which would enable them to persuade their equals, to acquire authority by a means which only political liberty admits.

In the colonies of other peoples, which the home land yet governs with absolute power, the masters, not having in turn to obey and command, showed the stupidity that is the property of despots and slaves, with the only exception of those individuals who have been brought up in the mother country, far from the spectacle of slavery. Our author proves, by facts and by the detailed testimony of all travelers, a contempt for any kind of education by: the Dutch colonists of the Cape of Good Hope, French colonists of Louisiana, and Spanish settlers in those of their provinces where slaves are most numerous.

In the United States, as there is political freedom, there is development of intelligence in masters. But the citizens, in the southern states, will only develop those faculties which will enable them to act on men; while the citizens, in the northern states, want to act both on men and on things, and they divide themselves at times between those two activities.

Also, the southern states may have produced more men inclined to govern specifically. Washington, destined to fight or to rule men, could be born on a land exploited by slaves; but a Franklin, intended to enlighten the world, and to increase the power of man over nature, could only have been raised in a country where the industrial arts were exercised by free hands.

As for slaves, the immediate effect of slavery is to stop all intellectual development in them. So too, in the

272

American colonies where all manual labor is performed by slaves, the masters are obliged to import from countries where slavery is not allowed, any industrial product which, to be produced, requires some intelligence. The masters can employ their slaves to fell and transport trees; but, if it is a question of building ships, they must first send these trees to countries where free workers can be found. They can do the cultivating of land, at

least roughly, and so obtain wheat by their labors; but when it comes to converting this wheat into flour, it has to be sent to places where there are workers capable of constructing mills. Slaves cannot even indulge in the variety of forethought that agriculture requires; they neither care enough nor have the intelligence to cultivate vegetables or fruit trees. And finally, their incapacity is such that agriculture is still in the most barbaric state, and that the masters have to import coal from England, used for heating, though they have forests maybe six miles away. Sometimes they even convert the coal into bricks from which they build their houses.

The causes of the incapacity of slaves in all types of industry are easy to see. The hands only perform well, when the task was well laid by the mind previously. Our physical organisms are only the insensible instruments of our intelligence; and when intelligence has not received any development, it cannot but badly direct the limbs that are at its disposal. However, in the countries where slavery is established, not only are masters unable to develop the intellectual faculties of their slaves, but almost all of them have a natural tendency to stop their own development of those. The need for security, stronger than the passion of avarice, obliges them to hold their enslaved men as close to the savage as they can get. Robin reports (1) that a French colonist from Louisiana kept repeating that he only was in fear of spirited negroes. He said all his attention was on

(1) Voyage in Louisiana, vol. III, Chap. 68, p. 197.

273

preventing them from acquiring it, and that he only succeeded too well. These colonists do not judge otherwise than the Romans. Censor Cato recognized nothing more dangerous than slaves with intelligence. When his own were idle, he forced them to sleep: lest they dare think (1)! The Anglo-Americans of the southern states, who were still recently the least ignorant and the less brutal of the masters, are repelling today with fear and torture, any attempt to teach their slaves to read. The colonists subject to the English government have seen since a long time, with no less than terror, the efforts to give some enlightenment to their slaves by several of their own countrymen, and raise them to the Christian religion (2). But, if slavery condemns masters to despise industry themselves, and their slaves to be incapable of it, is there any resource for a nation to be found in the class of those who are neither masters nor slaves? No; because, in a country where slavery is established, a man who belongs neither to the class of masters nor to that of slaves, unless he sells his output somewhere else, is obliged either to remain idle or to be despised. It's true enough that free men sometimes consent to work, this is only as much as the rise in wages compensates for the contempt attached to work; and even then a free worker either buys slaves, or disappear as soon as he has made some savings (3). The state of the proletariat, in the Roman republic, repelled from all work, either by contempt or by competition from the patricians' slaves, is a remarkable example of the frightening degradation and misery

to which slavery reduces that part of the nation which neither ranks among the masters nor among the slaves.

These are the effects of slavery on the physical organisms,

(1) Plutarch, *Life of Marcus Cato*.

(2) See the debates in the English House of Commons from 23 June 1825.

(3) La Rochefoucauld, *Voyage to the United States*; part 2, vol. IV, p. 293, 294; part 3, vol. VI, p. 75.

274

industry, and intelligence. But its effects on morals (1) are so much more degrading still. One of the first moral consequences that slavery produced among the Romans was lust and idleness. From the absence of intellectual and physical activity, coupled to the possession of wealth acquired through looting, an unbridled passion for all sensual pleasures was born. The greed and voracity of the elite reached a point, about which it is impossible to form an accurate idea of today. The land was devastated to provide for their debauchery, and the riches of a whole province were swallowed up in a single meal. The houses of the elite contained a multitude of slaves of both sexes, and with the morals of the masters quickly experienced the effects which were to result from such mixtures. Roman history provides shining examples of the most scandalous depravity. Mr. Comte points out two, in the heydays of the republic: the execution of one hundred and sixty wives of senators, convicted of a plot to poison their husbands who were neglecting them for their slaves, and the association of men and women, to indulge in common debauchery, discovered in the year 539 of Rome; the number of culprits, of which women made up the majority, rose above seven thousand: more than half were condemned to be tortured to death. We regret not being able to follow the author further, when he shows the Roman servitude worsening ever more with the progress of wealth and luxury among the masters; food rations decreasing for the slaves, and the tortures becoming more atrocious; revolts, servile wars, private revenges of slaves, multiplying the dangers both for each master and for the whole state.

Whenever men are condemned to unremitting and fruitless labors, are not masters of any of their movements, and are constantly being exposed to contempt, insult and arbitrary punishments, a simple death ceases to be a punishment. It is necessary, for it to

(1) Chap. VI, p. 80.

275

become formidable, likely to be accompanied by torture which in intensity exceed all the widespread and commonly occurring pains in the course of life. It was therefore necessary that the Romans who wanted to punish their slaves with death, imagined tortures calculated to frighten the men even most tired of putting up with life. Since the laws did not recognize in

slaves anything but properties, the punishments could only be determined by the whims of the masters. The most generally adopted was to tear them apart with rods, and then nail them to a cross. The individual's torments, who had thus been nailed, lasted several days before death finally came as a relief; unless the executor, out of pity, would have attacked any of the body's essential organs to put an end to it earlier. The writers who gave us the description of this torture do not say that women were exempted from it, nor even the youngest children who were condemned to perish when their master died from an unknown cause.

Mr. Comte then reviews the slave colonies of modern times (1), to show that slavery produced in all of them the very same effects: intemperance, dissolution, ferocity. We are going to refrain from retracing here the most appalling of these pictures; there is too much suffering in dealing with the torments of so many millions of human beings who at this very hour are moaning in grief. A few lines, taken from the various chapters, will have to suffice; for which we will continue to borrow the very terms of the author. Whenever a female slave has given birth to a child, one could judge by the color of this child, what kind of man had to be his father. It was all the more difficult to be mistaken about the connections of the masters with their enslaved women, in that there was never a marriage between whites and blacks; every half-blood child had to have been the product

(1) Chap. VII, p. 106, the Dutch; ch. VIII, p. 140, the English; ch. IX, p. 159, the Anglo-Americans; ch. X, p. 187, the French; ch. XI, p. 198, the Spaniards.

of an immoral union, it has almost always been the result of a master's violence perpetrated on his slave. Arriving at the cape of Good Hope, says Le Vaillant (1), we were surprised at the multitude of slaves as white as the Europeans that we see there. However, no white was ever enslaved in this country; slaves, on the contrary, have always been local negroes there. From the masters' connections with those girls, mulatto girls are born; and from their connections with them, even less dark daughters are born; finally, the traces of African blood disappeared, and the slaves ended up looking as white as their owners. But this phenomenon of slaves changing skin color is an important observation, found in almost all other colonies too. A colonist does not free the children born to him and his slave women. He demands of them the work and submission that he demands from all his other slaves; he sells them, exchanges them, or transmits them to his heirs, as he sees fit. If later one of his legitimate children receives them as a heritage, he makes no distinction between them and his other slaves. A brother thus becomes the slave owner of his own sisters and brothers; he exercises the same tyranny over them, he demands the same work from them, he tears them apart with the same whip, and he satisfies his same desires on them. This multitude of white slaves, astonishing the eyes of a visiting European are therefore almost always the fruits of adultery and incest. A traveler observes (2) that there is so little affection between parents in this colony, that we rarely see two brothers converse together.

How could a brother have tenderness for another, when maybe he has got ten or twelve brothers and sisters whom he considers to be the vilest of properties, and whom he uses to satisfy his most brutal desires on?

At the Cape of Good Hope, the soil is poor; it is dedicated to raising herds, and to producing the same

(1) Ibid. vol. I, p. 76.

(2) Barrow, vol. I, p. 130.

277

varieties of grain harvested in Europe. None of these agricultural products requires strenuous and ongoing work. Most products necessary for life are those which require the least fatigue, and which sell for the lowest price. Also, in Cape Town, in general, the slave's labor is not excessive, and his food is abundant. In Dutch Guiana, on the contrary, the soil is very fertile; it is suitable for producing sugar or other foodstuffs, which only grow in the tropics. These products obtained by long and arduous work are in the main intended for export. As their sale is easy, masters are interested in demanding from their slaves a more arduous and more continuous work. Like, on the other hand, food is scarce and expensive, their appearance does not leave them more than what is absolutely necessary for them to live on.

This opposition in circumstances does not only exist between Cape Town and Guiana; slavery, cruel and degrading everywhere, is however a bit softened, in grazing lands, by long rests and with sufficient food. In those lands where cereals are grown, the work is harder and more assiduous; but it is not to the point of preventing the servile population from increasing. In countries where coffee, cotton, tobacco, and especially sugar are grown, the work is excessive, the food completely insufficient, and births cannot keep pace with the mortality.

Beautiful slaves have to dread, not only the desires of their master or an overseer on whom they depend, but the atrocious punishments by which these often seek to overcome their resistance, and finally the jealousy that white women conceive against them.

A woman who punishes one of her slaves seeks above all to disfigure her and make her hideous. It's on the breast that she applies the lashes, even stabbing her there sometimes. Stedman says that a Creole lady, seeing on her husband's plantation a young and beautiful slave, immediately made an overseer apply a hot iron to the forehead, to the cheeks and mouth, and ordered that he cut an Achilles tendon at the same time. So in one instant,

278

he turned her from a beautiful person, into a sort of deformed monster (1). After examples that show how slavery in the English colonies and in the United States, is also morally corrupting there, the author quotes an even more odious law on the latter; since it is reflective, rather than an act where one cannot see more than the explosion of shameful passions. It is

expressly forbidden to any possessor of men, to develop the intellectual faculties of his slaves. The one who would be convicted for teaching one of them to read, would face a fine seven times larger than what he would incur by cutting off hands or a tongue. In the latter case, he would only be condemned to a fine of fourteen pounds; in the first, he would incur a hundred. It is also forbidden to let the slaves grow food for themselves. All meetings are forbidden to enslaved men; a white man who finds more than seven slaves together on a highway is required to give them lashes, without exceeding twenty lashes for each; and the slave who defends himself against a white is punished as having committed a horrible crime. No individual negro or of mixed blood can appear in the streets after dark, without special permission. The delinquents, free or slaves, are kidnapped by a military police who constantly roam the streets, and punish according to the circumstances (2).

Slavery was legal in all the Spanish colonies; but in all those who have made rapid progress towards prosperity, the number of negro slaves is either almost zero or infinitely small. The lands conquered from natives, although originally subjected to a very harsh regime, did not reduce their inhabitants to slavery. Thus, with the exception of Cuba, and of a small number of other lands producing the foodstuffs of the tropics, and subject to the plantation regime, all work in Spanish America was carried out by free hands; he was honored, and this single circumstance did more for the good of humanity than government despotism, its terror of enlightenment, the vigilance of the inquisition,

(1) Stedman, Voyage to Suriname; vol. II, p. 170, 171; vol. III, p. 101, 102.

(2) Travels in Canada and the United States, by Francis Hall, p. 424. The laws of the southern United States have been made even more cruel since the publication of Mr. Comte's book.

and all the circumspection which seemed taken to stop civilization. Mr. Comte proves by a series of facts that, in the Hispano-American colonies, the progress of intelligence, industry, population, and morality, have always been, according to the different regimes of each, in inverse ratio to the number of slaves and the severity of their treatment. It seems that after having proved that slavery vitiates the physical constitution of the slaves, that it renders the masters incapable of any work, and the slaves incapable of a work proportionate to the forces of free men. Any kind of intellectual exercise by slaves would disgust masters, and be banned. The formation of a middle class, being neither masters nor slaves, is prevented; and when it exists, is forced to emigrate; that slavery creates infamous and atrocious moral attitudes among the masters. And that by prohibiting slaves the will or the direction of their actions, it does not even allow them any pretension to have morals; or thereby is proof positive, that no institution more fatal than slavery could be introduced into society. That is not all, however, Mr. Comte also examines the influence that slavery had: on the guarantees of private liberty for masters, on the increase in obtainable wealth, on that of the population, on political freedom and the independence of nations; and,

in each of these interactions, he shows, through universal experience, that among all the peoples who have tolerated and lived with it, this frightful institution was not any less fatal to masters than to slaves.

In countries where slavery is allowed, an appalling calamity endlessly threatens free men, because their status can always be questioned. Indeed, if a person is presumed free until it has been proven that he is not, how will the masters manage to keep their

280

slaves? how will they pursue them, if they flee? how will they know in which places they have taken refuge? If, on the contrary, every individual is presumed to be a slave, until it has been proven that he is free, how will free persons not be constantly exposed to being treated as slaves (1)?

Among the ancients, nothing was more frequent than the theft of children. Often slaves took revenge on their masters; when fleeing, they took them along motivated by revenge, greed, or even tenderness. But, when misery pressed them next, they sold them. Ancient comedies constantly allude to these kidnappings. Virginia's story tells us that adults also, and especially women, were not immune either to "state matters"; which could legally take away their freedom and honor. In the English colonies any person of African descent, having a slight tint of the color that distinguishes a person from this part of the world, is presumed to be a slave until it is proven otherwise.

An individual of the species of masters, provided he is racially pure, can therefore seize any person, man, woman or child, who is not, and retain him or her as property until proven to be free, or until claimed by another owner. The one who can remove, by trickery or violence, the titles which prove that such or such an individual is free, makes them a slave by this single act; and, to appropriate the person, it suffices to take possession of him or her.

It's almost impossible to imagine the degree of misfortune and danger which weighs on all individuals of the colored species. Because on this legislative principle, in all the colonies of Europeans and in the United States, the appalling banditry by which free men or women are abducted in the Northern States, where slavery is abolished, to be resold in the Southern States; the infamous abuse of the

(1) Chap. XII, p. 223.

281

so-called apprenticeship contracts, to keep men who have a legal right to freedom in real slavery.

True enough these misfortunes hitherto affected only one race, for which the whites showed neither charity, nor sympathy, nor pity; a race from which they disengaged all moral and all religious duties, all the duties that bind us not only to man, but to all beings who can feel and suffer. But the vices of Europeans finally avenged the negroes. We have seen that the

children born out of their disorder are so similar to the white race that we can no longer distinguish them. The moment has arrived where completely white children can be stolen from their wealthy parents, and then sold as mulattoes, or sons and grandsons of mulattoes, without there being any way to counterclaim.

Turning next to the influence of slavery on the distribution of riches (1), Mr. Comte rightly protests against the immorality of this question: "Is the work done by slaves less expensive than that carried out by free men?" It is like asking if the properties that highway robbers acquire, by ransoming travelers, cost them less than those acquired by any kind of industry. It is in fact even worse, for it is to equate the most significant part of mankind with a production machine; which is all the more valuable the less value it absorbs from the wealth that it produces. But, after making one feel the extent of how inappropriate the question asked really is, he nevertheless manages to demonstrate that the work that a man obtains from a large number of others, by tearing their skin with lashes, costs him MORE than the work he would get from them by paying them a fair wage.

Simple arithmetic could show anyone master that it would be financially advantageous to abolish slavery individually;

(1) Ibid. ch. XIII, p, 237.

but on the basis of the national account, the one made by our author, it's even all the more important. He establishes that the system of slavery creates, distributes and accumulates much less wealth than any other system by which the work of society could be executed. In fact, in any country of slaves, with the masters having a horror for and being ashamed of working themselves; all their physical strength and at the same time all their intellectual and moral faculties, are lost for both the production and conservation of wealth. While on the other hand, the idleness to which they are condemned creates in them a passion for physical pleasures and all that can break the monotony of their existence: food, women, games of chance; in short. all the vices that quickly dissipate wealth produced by the work of others. Say in the same country, next door to the masters, only the slaves remain; and any other class of the population has disappeared. But the slaves have nothing and cannot accumulate anything; the slaves are descended to the last term of misery and brutality to which it is possible for man to arrive. Three causes have contributed to stupefy them: the first is the care that the masters, afraid of their own safety, take to make them stupid; the second, the works with which they overwhelm them, and which don't leave them time to think about anything; and the third, the complete absence of any interest, given their condition, in enlightening themselves. The slave is only accountable for the use of his gross physical forces; and when he has delivered the product to his master, the latter has nothing more to ask him.

Devoid of intelligence, the slave, with a quantity of given work, will do as little work as possible; lacking interest in the wealth it creates, given his

consumption, he will sabotage as much as he can; because for him, there is nothing but danger to save. In a country exploited by an enslaved people, only the physical organism of slaves remain for the production of wealth, removed from any principle of intelligently driven activity, and stimulated only by the action of the whip. Corporal punishment may well motivate a certain movement of the body; but it

283

cannot create the energy that free will provides; and, even if it managed to create it, a force destitute of skill, intelligence, and morality, could not produce, let alone preserve much wealth, no matter how energetic it might be.

We know very little about the ancient history of industrial development; but it seems that it prospered only among those peoples where slaves, still relatively few in number, were associated with work, rather than being exclusively responsible for it. It was the same was true for agriculture: it prospered under Roman consular hands; but, the more the number of kept slaves increased in Italy, the more the land lost its fertility; until finally needing to be converted only into pasture. Regarding the distribution of wealth, it is easier to judge the effect of slavery in the modern colonies. Agriculture is almost the only branch of industry that exists there; but it is exercised without due care, and without intelligence. Harvests that exhaust the soil, follow one another without interruption and without rest. Slaves, not aroused by any interest whatsoever, according to travelers, accomplish in any given time barely a tenth part of the work that free workers perform in France (1). Hence the foodstuffs, the fruit of their labor, are necessarily more expensive. The deterioration of the soil, wherever slavery is instituted is a well-known fact in the colonies, including the southern United States. The art of the carpenter, the joiner, the mason, is beyond the capacity of the slaves; the inhabitants of the southern states, in America, are obliged to bring workers from the northern states at great expense to build their houses; but these workers disappear again as soon as the jobs for which they were hired are completed. For maintenance and repair, it is necessary to wait until some new construction brings them back after several years. So there are fewer houses that are in good condition, and it sometimes happens to see a table sumptuously served and covered with silverware, in a room where

(1) Trip to Louisiana, Robin; vol. I, ch. VI, p. 92.

284

half of the windows have been missing for ten years (1). As a result, in slave countries, the masters must draw from abroad part of their food and all manufactured products, they thus pay more for all the services which require intelligence, and yet that they do not derive from their land even half the revenue they would get from it in a country without slaves; as this is the proportion established by the selling price of land, of equal size and

fertility. Also, almost all masters, almost all the owners of slave-cultivated land, are overweight and live in continual distress. According to a report presented to the House of Commons by the assembly of Jamaican settlers, these are almost all overwhelmed with debts, and a quarter of their sugar plantations were bankrupt and have been put up for sale since a few years by the judicial authority (2).

Seeking the influence of slavery on the increase of the various classes of the population, M. Comte ceases in particular on the principle, that, since the population can only increase with revenue, and as each master can live only by consuming the revenue created by five to ten of his slaves, the population of masters can only increase as much as that of slaves increases in a proportion of five to ten times higher (3). But, as the enslaved people, far from multiplying in slavery, are rapidly decreasing instead; the white population increase in the colonies will necessitate an ever more rapid increase in human trafficking, with all the crimes causing to be committed. The author summarizes in these terms the influence of domestic slavery on the spirit and nature of government thus(4): in a state where one part of the population is owned by the other as property, we find that

(1) La Rochefoucauld, Voyage to the United States; vol. V, Part. II, p. 95.

(2) The report is for February 25, 1825. East and West India Sugar; p. 121, 122, 128.

(3) Chap. XIV, p. 283.

(4) Chap. XV, p. 299.

a large portion of the class of masters is naturally disposed (by its constant financial distress and its aversion for all work) to impose power, and to appropriate the wealth created by the other; we find that the part of the population that can only live on its labor, and whose slavery demeans or prevents industry, is also willing to band together with any individual who proposes to enslave or destroy the class of masters. Finally we find that despotism, even the most violent, which weakens or destroys the power of the masters, is a blessing for slaves. Therefore the tendency of the mass of the population leads it towards the establishment of the despotism of one; and, when this despotism is established, it will be exercised with rapacity, brutality, cruelty and stupidity, as is set about in the exploitation of their slaves.

From the facts gathered to enable a judgment regarding the influence of slavery on the independence of peoples (1), two important truths result. The first is that all men who reduce others to servitude, or who become owners of slaves, by this very fact put themselves between two enemies: they run the risk of being massacred by men that they own, or to be enslaved by strangers. The second is that whenever a real coalition arises between internal enemies and external enemies, the masters have no means of resistance.

But we must finish this long extract; and yet seven other chapters still remain to be analyzed. Perhaps none deserves our attention more than that which deals with 'the reciprocal influence of slavery on religion, and that

of religion on slavery' (2). However, we cannot point, by an extract, to supplement the book which we analyze; we only wanted to inspire the desire to read it, by doing to see how much, before Mr. Comte, the effects of slavery had been little sought after, how important its history is in

(1) Ibid. chap. XVI, p. 330.

(2) Ibid. chap. XVIII, p. 378.

286

the general history of mankind, how much it spreads light on the rapid decadence of the great peoples of antiquity, how much suffering and misfortune it foresees for modern peoples who persist in preserving this all-devouring leprosy. No one will read Mr. Comte's book on slavery without seeing any new light shine from it. Of course, before having opened it, we did not believe ourselves indifferent to the suffering of our enslaved brothers, nor were we lukewarm in our feelings about slavery. However, the reading of this book was for us a revelation of all that this system of absurdity, atrociousness, ruinousness stands for; and of its effectiveness in destroying everything that gives value to the nations, or a price to life. Such is the impression that we received from it. We long for others to receive it in turn; for, we repeat, far from slavery only being a calamity to specific times in the past, this calamity is present, it is still threatening, it is spreading among nations destined to multiply with an extreme speed, and is already settled on some of the most beautiful parts of habitable land. Never, perhaps, was it more important for the destinies of mankind to show what slavery necessarily is, to dry up this source of misery, stupidity and crimes, in the countries which are opening up to a new civilization.

287

NINTH ESSAY

The Procedure to Remove Negro Cultivators from Slavery.

It is such a strange and painful thing to watch the state of suffering and misery to which the cultivating class has been reduced over almost the entire face of the earth.

The riches produced by the soil are the first that man learns to desire, they are the most necessary for his existence, and those who produce them have titles not to his pity only, but to his gratitude. At the beginning of all of history we see the cultivators in a state of freedom, peace and innocence. This depiction is so gratifying to our imagination that poets in all idioms express happiness in the life of the fields. The fables of the enchanted age, the pastoral poems of all nations, the sweetest reveries of the wise these days; we also represent as the goal of our desires this alternative country

work and leisure in abundance. Our eyes can encounter this happiness in any country where the farmer is free and its owner; and the Swiss peasant, even maybe the Tuscan peasant, in his real life has nothing to envy to the peasant gifted by the imagination of poets. And yet, in the places where wealth has accumulated the most, the peoples who boasted the most of their civilization seem to have striven to present the condition of the cultivator always as more deplorable, to recognize what is the last term of suffering and deprivation to which it is possible to reduce it just without depriving him of life and the ability to work, so as not

288

having to grant him anything beyond. We saw what the most opulent, the most civilized and the most human nation in Europe, has made from its cultivators. In the fate of the Scottish and Irish peasants, we were able to recognize the one condition that threatens and which has already partly affected the English themselves, the one towards which those of the rest of Europe, if the false teachings of chrematistics continue to be welcomed by other nations, are running as well.

But it is also the most civilized peoples of Europe, who set out to strip the non-cultivator of all that they deemed superfluous to the maintenance of his existence, of all that could spread some pleasure on this existence; but even of his reason for being, and his freedom. They sacrificed a race of men, different from theirs, to their greed; they reduced it to the rank of brutes. They denied the exercise of his will and the knowledge of good and bad to its individuals. They renewed for them the slavery they had abolished in their own homes, and hating the negro because of the insults they heaped on him, they refused to see him as a man, while maintaining against him the grudge, the envy, the desire for vengeance that man alone can excite. They did not even calculate what was the necessary sustenance to maintain his existence; it sufficed for them to find that one by means of which the slave could die at the doled out punishment most profitably for his master. They estimated that with insufficient food and excessive work, a negro could last ten years under the whip; after this term it was better that he died anyway, and the master got another one for him instead. It was on this infamous calculation that the slave trade was founded, and at the present time, it is still not entirely abolished.

The Dutch, the English, the French, the Spaniards, the Portuguese, all made this appalling calculation, and took part in this atrocious trade. It is true that a small number of adventurers, the scum of each of these nations, went alone, far from his homeland, to be defiled by so many crimes. The Americans of the United States, more guilty than all of them, have in their own country, within their families, in a land of

289

freedom, continued to this day to outrage the laws of God and Nature, vitiating the cultivator below the brute; they traded from state to state; and

when they heard mankind's cry of horror, they did not respond other than by redoubling their oppressive measures.

However the time when this scandalous violation of brotherly love which should bind all men, and of eternal justice, will no longer be tolerated on earth, is quickly approaching. The negro slave will be relieved even before the Irish farmer, because the negro is the victim of iniquitous legislation, which strikes one at the first sight; while the suffering of the Irishman is attached to a complicated system, difficult to grasp and even more difficult to judge, and which suggests that the one who suffers is only a victim of his own faults. The English nation, indeed, gloriously repairing the wrongs of ancestors, has already taxed itself to redeem, at a huge pecuniary cost and sacrifice, those it had let enslave. Its example is irresistible; with some fury that greed, or the colonists' thirst for domination, is yet striving to repel. The French government has already announced that it is preparing to follow the English; that it is only hesitating on the method, and when these two great nations will have rehabilitated the negroes to the rank of men, it will not long be possible for any other nation to still treat them like brutes.

What is the aim for the legislator to have in mind regarding a proposal to make changes, when comparing colonies with slave populations and all other cultivated countries today? We believe to have already prepared the answer to this question in all previous Essays. A government is responsible for doing all it can to ensure public happiness. Its duty is to evoke to all its subjects, or the greatest possible number of its subjects, to the greatest possible happiness depending on their being. The maximized condition, the one most likely to be happy making, and the one that contributes the most to the happiness of all the others, is that of the cultivators. In the colonies it is the sole condition that is wealth creating; in these exceptional countries, they allow all of society its rest. The legislator's aim therefore is to intent to have the colonies cultivated by peasants, living in abundance, free and happy. They are the ones who make up the greatest number, they are the ones who constitute and contribute the most to public happiness.

290

The legislator must however still seek, regarding the surplus product of the work of these peasants, the means of securing a revenue to landowners, so that men of leisure and intelligence will intermingle with the population of the colonies at large.

Finally, his intent must be that the revenue of these two classes, coming about from agriculture, leaves them enough ease so that their consumption creates new prosperity to benefit other industries, either by receiving its products from the motherland, or by industrial development from scratch in the colony itself; employing men, providing for needs that the products of the fields do not satisfy.

In these three respects, the situation of the colonies is precisely the reverse of that what we see that a legislator's intention should be at home. All the works of that culture are accomplished by infinitely unhappy cultivators, almost naked, hungry, degraded, stupid, but profoundly the enemies of an

order to which they are subject. All landed properties are in the hands of pathological rich people, overwhelmed with debts that they cannot meet; having for their revenue only commodities they cannot sell because their price declines every year. Finally, the industrial class is suffering too; so far not nearly as bad as it is in the colonies, but the merchants of the home country are experiencing continual bankruptcies, caused by their colonial debtors' inability to pay off their debts. But how could it be otherwise, when by far the greatest number of the colonies' inhabitants, the slaves, have nothing? and do not consume anything, that the so-called rich are in a state of embarrassment?!

How then does it come about that in the colonies, agriculture leaves both the cultivators and the owners in a state of embarrassment? These regions are after all located under the most beautiful climate in the universe; their soil is incomparably more fertile than that of any part of Europe; all the more, since it is

291

peculiar to these productions of the tropics whose enjoyable taste has today spread everywhere, that the planter for a long time now has been able to exercise monopoly rights, for his sugar and coffee, against the richest and most civilized countries of world. At the same time, these colonies do not pay taxes; the costs of their government, the costs of their own defense, are not their responsibility. The guarantee that they would be able to give to themselves what they have got coming, comes from a country less favored by nature, but wiser and better governed than they are. Where does this lack of profit come from, this sterility of revenue? One cause we have already had occasion to report about more than once. Greed deceives the one who abuses his power; it is a gain empty of real substance, and soon ruinous, in that which the producer makes on that who helps him to produce; and in particular we could see this in detail in the previous Essay, slavery is the most costly of all manners to get the jobs of man carried out; it is the one that, with the largest advances, engenders the least profit; it is to his own pity that the master brutalized and debased the slave, taken from him his will and intelligence, and left him only with spite. He may then all in vain, cut back on his food, his clothing and his lodging, and dispute with him all the necessities of life; but he still costs too much to maintain in this state of brute force to which he reduced it. Even accounting for nothing the purchase price of a negro, his upkeep is still not worth his work, as when compared with the upkeep and work of a free man.

We must in no way lose sight of the important fact, of the comparatively high cost of servile labor; for one, because it must be concluded that the owner has no right to compensation at the time of the abolition of slavery. He has, in fact, and according to existing laws, no useful property in the work of his slave; despite all their iniquity, a slave is only entitled from his work as much as the cost of his upkeep to live. If the negro wasn't his slave the situation would be essentially the same, except that in the latter case, he would get much more work out of him.

Planters respond to this comparison of the costs of

292

free and bonded labor, by embarrassing your mind with the details of a sugar cane plantation, and the assertion that sugar cannot be cultivated without slavery. Rather, it seems that we should conclude that their sweet products are only ruined by slavery. Can we doubt that sugar cane is no longer infinitely more suitable for producing sugar than beetroot, that the latter not only contains much more sweet matter to extract, but that its refinement is also much easier?

However, beetroot is cultivated by the hands of those that are free; it is cultivated with intelligence, skill and affection, by those interested in its success. Sugar cane is cultivated, at the price of blood and tears, by men who would like to see the fields they are digging into swallowed up in the abyss. The beet enriches the French farmer; while sugar cane ruins the West Indian planter. There is talk about putting a tax on the production of beet sugar; but before the basics are to be asked, all of Europe is already hastening to borrow the cultivation method of beetroot from the French, and to build new refineries. By the way, the sugar industry is pretty much lost for the Antilles, at least as long as slavery is maintained there. This used to be a rich industry, and one which could bear extraordinary costs of production, as long as a few square leagues of a fertile soil, located in the tropics, a monopoly on the production of sugar could be exercised against the whole known universe. But since the introduction to the West Indies of the much more productive cane of the South Sea islands; since transfer of cane to the plains of South America, which all by itself could produce a hundred times what the world would like to consume; since the arrival of sugar from the East Indies; and finally since the invention of beet sugar, planters should only think about the old products of their dreams as a golden age that cannot ever come back.

Planters are still trying to persuade the authorities that a formal abolition of slavery is not necessary, since it is already taking place imperceptibly. They published statistical data intended to establish that in the French islands,

293

the masters are eager to grant freedom to the negroes who deserve it, and that the number of freedmen increases everyday. We could quibble with them on the nature of these emancipations, on their reasons, and especially on the condition of the "patronés"; but the first answer to be given to them is that they have not yet taken a single step to found the sugar-cane culture of the colonies based on paid labor. What the earth needs, what agriculture needs, what humanity needs, what national security needs, is free and happy working peasants. The manumissions, which were indeed frequent in the colonies, have involved only the class of the city proletarians; but in countries where cities have no industry. The freedmen provide the seaports with livelihoods such as: water porters, commission agents, boatmen, and

small merchants of drinks or edibles. They are now the servants of the public, instead of being those of individuals; but they never rise to one of the professions where wealth is created; they are never hired, even as day laborers, in the service of agriculture, from which the only revenue of the country is born; they never are hired monthly or yearly in the limited number of trades which are exercised by free men in the tropics. Living day by day in idleness, misery and vice; awaiting the orders of the first passer-by, they deteriorate more and more, and fall back on all the unfair prejudices directed toward them. There is more to do than to just break the chains of slavery that keep the negro in the mire; standing his ground on the same footing as any planter – he must be made a peasant. First off it is necessary so that the soil of the colonies continues to be cultivated, so that the most crucial work of all to a population's existence be accomplished, so that territorial wealth won't be lost, and so that all the capital fixed on the ground, or circulating for asserting its continuance, not be lost. It is necessary for society to exist, because with whites believing themselves dishonored through work, such as seen today in the colonies; without peasants or slaves: freedmen, porters, and messengers, would be the sole condition under which society would continue

294

and in less than two years the entire population of the country would be swept away by famine.

The negroes must be elevated to the rank of peasants for their happiness, for their morality, for their intelligence. Their interest must be the first in the eyes of the legislator; for they are by far the most numerous; they are the more important, as being the only ones who give life to all others; they are victims of a terrible injustice, of a crime which the laws of God and of men equally condemn; of a crime which does not only deprive them of all what is good and happy on this earth, but with all intelligence, virtue, of the sacred character of the human race, perhaps of any future. In the name of all that they have suffered, of everything what society owes to them, their interest must in the eyes of society, come before all other interests. But it is still needed that the negroes be raised to the rank of peasants for the national advantage, so that the largest number in society no longer asks for an upheaval of society; so that it is no longer ready to join any internal or external enemy that will inspire it to break its yoke. Tainted legislation, and a morality corrupted by inhuman mistrust, iniquitous condemnations, and atrocious torments need to end; so that work stops being dishonored; so that all members of society contribute to creating and accumulating wealth; so that the largest class of the nation falls under the category of consumers, so that it contributes to give activity to all the industries of the towns and to commerce, both in the colony and in the mother country. And finally, the negroes must be elevated to the rank of peasants for the benefit of the planters themselves, the owners of the land. We will not insist on bringing to bear moral advantages so that they will agree; on the obstacle to the development of their intelligence, which they will set aside; on a seduction to all vices, that they will keep away from their families; nor on

the dagger ceaselessly raised over them, from which they won't withdraw; nor on a thousand dangers that threaten their children, to which they will

295

set an unrealistic limit. The planters need to elevate the negroes to the rank of peasants in order to regain some financial independence. They need to change their way of cultivation, because it is of all the most expensive, produces the least, and is the most ruinous. The direction given to their culture, whose products are entirely intended for foreign markets, is the one that most exposes them to trade wars and congestion. Today there is already an overabundance of all their products on all markets, it will lead them to certain ruin, of which they cannot be saved; in France, the unjust monopoly that Customs grants them against French consumers, will end. There is no country in the known world where owners are as constantly burdened as they are in the colonies; there is none where there are so many bankruptcies in the wealthy class; there is none where the lands, some of the most fertile in the universe, have less value. Indeed, the price of a plantation is calculated by the number of negroes who are attached to it; landowners don't even flatter themselves to be reimbursed in full of their purchase price. The whole value of the land usually covers it all. It is true, that this benefit must be given to the planters in spite of themselves; for they resist distress sales with all their might, with all their passions. Admittedly this is not the first time that we see a class of men blind to their true interests, rejecting what is useful to them, choosing what, for their part, harms them; and above all to prefer what exists, with all its drawbacks, to the unknown which is offered to them in exchange. There is, moreover, in all the antecedents of the masters, something else which is capable of deluding them. They bought slaves for some price in capital, they sell them for capital; when they lose they must replace them with capital. They doubtlessly would need a great enough power of abstraction to understand that the property they have in their negroes is equal to nil, absolutely nothing. It is a fact, however; for what did they buy, when buying a negro? the added value of

296

his work over his maintenance; but that's exactly the same a bargain they would make with any free cultivator whom they had called upon to exploit their land. Only the maintenance of the negro, though much worse, costs them more than if he were free, because he is not spared by his economy. The negro's labor, though forced, is worth less than if it came from a free man; because he is not ruled by his intelligence in approaching any job. For the owner, the only question is one of money; it is the comparison between the surplus value which remains to him in each system of culture. It must be said that the power that a master exercises on his slave cannot be evaluated only by money. It is a pleasure to command like a despot and to be obeyed instantly; it's a pleasure to make people tremble, to be able to reward or punish according to one's whim, to be above the rules of justice,

to believe oneself superior to a whole race of men, to despise them when held contemptible, and to be able with their assistance to satisfy all his passions, all his vices; but these are “pleasures”, society must in no way yield to any order or class of citizens.

The legislator, in order to raise the negroes to the status of farmers, must first of all find out what the cultivation contract should entail; which, by guaranteeing the interest of the owners, ensures the most happiness, and with it a moral and intellectual development. He must also seek the same regarding men, emerging from slavery, and devoid of everything, even of intelligence and willingness to work, are able to accomplish. And finally he must seek what kind of assistance the government can give to prepare slaves for this new condition, to keep their work of nurturing society going through this time of changing relations between them and their masters; and maintain the new order by a suitable system of sanctions and rewards. We have already prepared answers to these various questions in the Essays preceding this one; we have studied several contracts between owners and cultivators,

297

means by which the land is developed, and we have on more than one occasion expounded their history; showing by what path the various peoples, our ancestors among others, came from slavery to freedom. Injustice and barbarism isn't country specific but happened all over, and the crime of which the negroes are now victims has been committed many times over in all regions of the earth. We will end however by recapping our observations, preferring to expose ourselves to some repetition rather than to leave some obscurity here.

The conditions under which the free peasant, or on the point of becoming one, cultivates the land for another person can be reduced to four main ones. He can donate half of his work to the owner, in exchange for land that the latter gives to him, and with the peasant using the latter to sustain himself; he may not receive land for its own, but works that of the owner, sharing the yield with him; he can, instead of having use of half the crops, promise a fixed annuity for a determined period, at the end of which the land returns to the owner; and finally he can get title in perpetuity to the land, but under the obligation to also provide in perpetuity this same fixed annuity, or a defined set of services. The first contract constitutes the serf; the second, the sharecropper; the third, the farmer; the fourth, the owner burdened with royalties. We see that the proletarian of agriculture, or day laborer, is not understood to be categorized under the name of ‘peasant’. Indeed, he doesn't belong to the ‘country’, and the country doesn't belong to him.

Do not be surprised that the serf is included in this progressive scale; the serf, as constituted by his contract with his owner, in Hungary, Poland, and Russia, is no longer a slave, although the political power of the lord to whom he is still subject could and should have been greatly diminished. The serf is considered the property of a master, but he himself also has property of his own: a house, fields, herds, his teams. He owes personal

services to the one who owns him for only three days of the week, during the other three he is the master of his

298

person and over his property. This contract is bad: it stupefies man, it stops the progress of agriculture, it creates and maintains feelings of hatred; but it doesn't make peasants by far as unhappy as the agricultural proletariat is in countries which claim to be more civilized. The comparison between the Russian peasant and the Irish peasant, as to food, lodging, clothing, and a security for the future, would be greatly to the disadvantage of the latter. Furthermore this contract is bad because of its servility origin ever remaining its mainstay; it is bad by resemblances, which allows it to be compared in subsistence between the serf and the slave.

Indeed, for three days the serf works as a free man in his own fields, with intelligence and love, because it is animated by hope; but during the other three days he works as a slave on the lord's field, with disgust, with fear, with laziness. To awaken his attention and hasten his work, an overseer, in Russia as in the Antilles, sometimes urges him on with the whip. But the whip, both in Russia as in the West Indies, can never replace intelligence and will; and the serf in his three days of drudgery does not do the work, which he is accustomed to doing on one of his free days. Perhaps on another occasion we will examine how the Russian and Polish peasants could be brought up in a better condition. We are careful not to propose the introduction of serfdom in the Antilles to replace slavery there, for although the negroes and whites in some respects would gain; it also would be unfortunate to stop halfway in the reform, when we would still be facing all the same obstacles needing to be overcome.

The condition of the Eastern European countries shows enough how much this contract hinders progress of rural science and civilization. It wouldn't be wrong however, perhaps to admit it as an exception, 'ad terrorem', and to chastise those negroes who would not want to comply with any system of culture, who would be deaf to their own interest and resist working, as soon as they were removed from the overseer's whip.

299

The sharecropper contract as we have represented it in its provision of happiness to the peasant of Tuscany, is also the one which seems to us the most suitable to return the negroes to happiness, to maintain the culture in a prosperous state, and to ensure the owner a higher revenue than that he currently withdraws from its plantations. This contract may be, in all places, the most equitable, the one that maintains the most considerable revenue for the owner, while guaranteeing the most enjoyment and security for the peasant. But it is to the colonies in particular and to a population that is withdrawn from slavery that it seems particularly appropriate. We have shown, on the other hand, the disadvantages of renting, even in the most prosperous countries, and its tendency to establish unfair competition between growers, which can reduce them, as

in Ireland, to the most appalling distress. But it's especially in its practical application to the colonies that the contract of rent seems unenforceable. It is therefore in view of the state of those countries where slavery is to be abolished that these two contracts must be compared to each other. It is between them that we will have to choose: serfdom can only be considered as a penal system, which could be used in cases of insubordination; perpetual concessions encumbered with fixed royalties, to which Europe's happiest peasants now owe the advantages of property, can hardly be obtained, as we will get back to later on, as these are due to certain circumstances which are not found in the colonies. So, if one wants to have peasants in the colonies, one has to make negroes either farmers or sharecroppers; and if there isn't a circumstance, which in some country decides the choice between these two systems, sharecropping is the one favored. The cultivation of countries located between the tropics is exercised, even more than that of the southern countries in Europe, on perennials and shrubs. Sugar cane, cotton, indigo, tobacco, are perennial; the coffee, the nopal, are shrubs; the cocoa tree is a tree; banana, palm, cassava, are all food plants that have occupied the land for a long time. In all of

300

Europe it has been proven that the cultivation of tree plants, vine and olive tree, could not be entrusted to the farmer, who, in order to obtain a better deal for the renewal of his farm, would have an interest in neglecting them at the end of his lease and in a state of suffering or exhaustion. The plants which occupy the ground for a long time generally repel the plow and the implements which tend to shorten the work; they demand to be cultivated by hand with attention, address, and interest in their conservation; it is especially because the slave is secretly the enemy of his master that his work is ruinous to the colonies. The sharecropper, on the contrary, is his master's partner; and the care he gives to each plant is proportioned to the fruits he expects from it. True enough, the farmer is also interested in the prosperity of his farm during the term of his lease; but even so, he can't do his work alone, he is obliged to resort to hirelings, and these, by their negligence, cause shortly thereafter the loss of these perennials which cannot perish without ruining the plantation.

If the nature of the culture in the colonies, of this culture expressed by the very name of plantation, imposes the condition of returning a considerable capital entrusted by the planter to the land; only to the one who will have an interest equal to his in its conservation, the nature of the men by whom this culture can be carried out, demands yet more imperatively that we do not make them farmers but sharecroppers. The nature of farming industry is too specialized to be able to be undertaken by a man recently coming out of slavery. In farming, as it takes all responsibilities on itself, it also needs to be removed from all control; of sticking to products that are sold easy, giving up others; to do its work, its harvests, its markets, when it is deemed most opportune. But there is not a negro in the colonies that a planter would want entrust his land to such a condition. Sharecroppers, on

the other hand, usually let themselves be directed by their owner; as he remains associated with the land, and their interest is a common one,

301

both also want to benefit from the knowledge, the experience, the skill of each other. A peasant facing a situation on his old heritage in fertile Italy, regardless the experience picked up over the years, will yet never refuse the advice of a neighbor, whom he believes to be more knowledgeable. On the plantations where the master was accustomed to command and the negro to obey, where the first was supposed to have all the experience, intelligence, and foresight, while the second did not even know he had a will of his own, a tractability of the sharecropper would be reigning until he himself had acquired an experience which could enlighten the owner. If the character of the type of culture and that of the cultivator equally take issue with renting, the distribution of the capital intended for agriculture makes it still more impossible in the colonies to find farmers, and leaves for the negroes no other condition than that of sharecroppers. It must be remembered that man comes out of slavery absolutely without anything; in fact he did not even own the property of his person. We give that to him, but we don't give it anything beyond that. It is customary however, that the owner advances all his capital to the sharecropper; and he can do this, for he constantly directs it, so this capital kind of never leaves his hands. But he would never agree to advance the capital to a farmer who has nothing, who does not offer any guarantee. He asks, he has to ask his farmer, not only to have the necessary capital to subvent his farm; but still respond, until a certain point, for bad harvests too. Because the rent to be paid must be a proportional average over the years included in the lease: the owner gives up the most favorable profit to the farmer, so as not to find himself without revenue in the worst case. But how to make such a deal with one who has nothing, who cannot lose anything, and who thus cannot promise anything either? The freed slave cannot possibly be a farmer. It seems however, that those who dealt with the emancipation of the negroes, especially in the English colonies, took it for granted: either that they would present themselves as farmers, or that planters would be the farmers of their estates.

302

They did not dream of turning the negroes into peasants, but just into new proletarians: fit to be called upon during the emergency of the work of the countryside, and then to be returned. Perhaps they left the acting measure incomplete on purpose, to get the British nation to adopt it with so much generosity. They did not bring the negroes out of slavery, or at least out of distress; although they bought them at a great price. They did not ensure the revenue of the owners, they did not guarantee to the nation either the continuation of the culture, nor the peace of the country (1). For the happiness of the agricultural population it is to be desired, as we have said elsewhere, let it all be the following condition: that there be full

employment, so that each one can enjoy life; that laborers are not to be divided into two separate classes – one of which making its profit from the deprivations of the other. It's not the wealth of a few farm entrepreneurs, it is the ease of all farmers that we regard as humanity's wish. In addition, in terms of the improvement of agriculture, the industrious farmer, the useful farmer, is the one who puts his hands to work, the one who gives examples of vigilance, perseverance, sobriety; one who himself can perform all the work he asks of his workers and his servants; one who eats at the same table as them, who teaches them to be content with his frugality, and who ensures by his own experience that the food he gives them is sufficient to maintain or renew their vigor. It is only in this way that the farmer, or the owner who takes it upon himself to be his own farmer, who by keeping his soil in his hands, can carry out his agriculture economically and with intelligence. There likely is not a single skillful agronomists in perhaps all of Europe, who in his turn has not experienced, on a farm that he manages by himself; that if he does not know how to practically do something that he knows well in theory, all this knowledge is useless to him; that if he is not in the fields himself at dawn, he will lose at least one hour every day of his workers' labor; that if he doesn't know how to make use of his tools like them, he will have to be content only with a semblance of the output of a real job; that if he does not eat with them, their upkeep will cost him

(1) We have already dealt with this question in "Memoirs" inserted in the *New Monthly Magazine*, in London; the *North American Review*, in the United States; and the *Revue mensuelle d'économie politique* dated December 1833, in Paris.

303

double because of waste. He might try to have himself replaced by a so-called 'master valet'; whom he will indeed pay the wages for, but never get a replacement for the eye, nor for the will of a master.

The attempted emancipation in the English colonies, transforming the negroes not into peasants, but into agricultural proletarians, as in day laborers, supposes that they still will be under the direction of white men, who will be farmers of an entire plantation; or, under that of the owner himself, each governing his own domain, 'farming his own land'; because this system of operating, which is quite exceptional in Europe, is assumed to be normal operating procedure in the West Indies. But in fact it's asking from a farmer in the colonies, something that is unobtainable. For if it isn't possible to find such a person among negroes, it is hardly less impossible to find him among the whites.

Everything is lacking at the same time for the adventurers who are seeking their fortune in the islands: capital, credit, and knowledge in agriculture, especially of that in the country in question; and, most often too, personal integrity. Moreover, an invincible prejudice takes away the agronomists' ability regarding all white people as well; to master owners and farmers alike: 'work is a disgrace to the white race'. Also any white governing a plantation, whether as an owner himself, or a manager, or curator of a

bankruptcy, or farmer; if any of these encountered, has never put his hands to a hoe, never tried any of the work in the fields, never shared a negro's meal, and he is content to go through the plantation at certain times, to receive reports from his second in command and the overseers, giving orders and punish his picking negroes; he can only have concluded that terror alone accounts for vigilant and effective plantation management. His ignorance and his imperfect inspection cannot make the plantation progress other than through slavery. A farmer in Europe would soon be ruined

304

if he wasn't more of a farmer than he is. Indeed, among the causes of the distressed situation of all planters, it is not necessary to account any less for the totally inadequate coordination of whites' work on the plantation, than the reluctance to work displayed by slaves.

So it seems that there is very little success to be expected for the whites themselves, as long as through the whites' fault, an operational system where all the management and inspection of the works, all the sentiments of property, all the intelligence, is reserved for whites alone; while the negroes, like day laborers, should only contribute with the strength of their arms. But if the proposed transformation of former slaves into proletarians is insufficient to ensure the interests of the former masters, how much more incomplete, how further disappointing must it be for those who wanted ensure the betterment of the negroes! In dealing with Ireland, we studied the frightening state of society into which the colonies would be dragged. We would see, on the one hand, a small number of owners trying to save money on the work required by their plantations, either because they lack capital, or because colonial production would continue to lower prices in the world's markets; while on the other hand, a class of very numerous workers having absolutely nothing but their arms, offering themselves at will and at a discount to do jobs that we wouldn't want to give them. And between the both, no protective law for the poor, no charitable institutions, and to top it off, no sympathy. With such kind of exploitation of day laborers, in the seasonal breaks between the major harvests, when half of the negroes would be fired, the sorry picture is going to emerge of a missionary coming to their old masters to tell them that the negro freedmen are dying of hunger and asking for their charity. When rereading the proceedings of the Jamaican assembly, and so figuring out what their answer would be is going to make humanity shudder. We hate slavery more than anyone, but of course, we also firmly believe that the Irish proletarian is frequently reduced to a state of misery which the negro slave has never known. The Irishman's hut is

305

poorer still, more devoid of any furniture, of anything resembling utensils, of all comfort, than the hut of the negro; the clothing of one is as shameful as that of the other. And yet a humid and cold climate are making proper

clothing and housing most indispensable for the first. Irish food is much less varied and a good deal less succulent; the Irishman's work is more constant and prolonged. It is true enough that the negro is exposed to the whip of the commander during his work, at the whim and acts of ferocity of the master, while the Irishman, instead of corporal punishment, knows only the moral punishment of famine which threatens him and his family every day. We still differentiate between the state of one and that of the other, but certainly if the act of emancipation which is bringing glory to the British Parliament has had no other effect than to elevate the negro to the condition of the Irish proletarian, it most certainly won't be worth the twenty million pounds sterling which it is costing the nation.

France, by accomplishing in its turn the reparation it owes to humanity, must approach the job more directly. It must accomplish its work, and elevate the negro, a French subject, as an equal to the French peasant. At the same time it must serve the colonist in spite of himself, and give him the security presented by the revenue of the average French owner. It is because the sovereign must think of him in spite of his faults, and to hold the right measure in his favor, that we do not propose to elevate the negro on the owner's back. Even though in a large part of France, in its day, the peasant became the slave owner, and let it become the main cause of the attained prosperity in these very provinces. The anarchy in the middle ages and its private wars have spread a benefit over mankind, that we would hardly have expected; were we to have been witness to their devastations. Ambition took the place of greed in the lords; they wanted to transform their wealth in strength; they made vassals of their slaves, to whom they asked for services instead of annuities. They felt the need to find affection in their defenders, as well as courage, honor and virtue, which are all

306

incompatible with slavery; and to awaken it in their hearts they granted them independence. If they had demanded from their vassals, in money or in foodstuffs, the entire surplus value over their maintenance, in terms of the products of their work; they would not have awakened that activity of the soul which shone in the eleventh and twelfth century in a stock of people previously degraded and enslaved; and which revived with such inconceivable rapidity the population, the agricultural industry, the value of and attachment to the homeland. The negroes would make infinitely more rapid progress in intelligence, virtue and prosperity, if they became owners of the soil which they cleared; we have no doubts about it, and we can see the proof of this in Santo Domingo. The journal of a traveler who visited this island most recently, tells us that the plains where there were large plantations and large sugar factories, are all still devastated by the consequences of the atrocious war, that continued there for many years, but that the hills, where poor negro families took refuge to enjoy freedom and their independence; where they cleared and then planted land that was entirely theirs, where they decided to providing for their own needs, and not of preparing cargoes for foreign markets. This journal presents a series

of sketches of industry, abundance, virtues and happiness, which soothe the heart in a country still imprinted with the memory of so many crimes. But the legislator, far from favoring a bloody revolution which upset all the properties like that of Santo Domingo, must do everything in his power to avoid calamities like that; far from allowing owners to become warriors of their slaves, freeing them, as the lords did in the Middle Ages, he must ensure that the citizens do not usurp any part of the public force. The soil of the colonies is at present the legitimate property of the planters, while in Scotland, Ireland, the land belonged in part to the tenants, and for this reason we believe that the legislator should give back to them recently usurped rights. To the colonies, to the contrary, although it is desirable to see the negroes, or at

307

least a portion of them, to rise to the condition of peasant owners. All to which the legislator must aim, is to make them peasants under the only suitable contract, both to them and to their masters; that is, sharecroppers. Because there would be a danger in only making them either farmers, or serfs, or proletarians.

To change the fate of the negroes, we must understand both the condition from which we draw them and the condition where we want them to arrive at. The law did not confer rights on slaves, but nonetheless it did impose obligations on the masters towards them; obligations which they contract by the mere fact of having bought slaves. Indeed, slavery includes a useful right and a political right. The useful law, as we have said, is the added value of work over sustaining the worker. The negro is bound to use for his master all the physical force that he can deploy without perishing. The master is obliged to feed, to house, and to clothe his slave, as much as, in an unscrupulous country public decency demands it. Nourish him the days of rest that religion grants people, the days of rest imposed by seasonal bad weather, or that the completion of major harvests leaves free; just like normal working days; also to feed and medicate him when sick, in early childhood and in old age, even though it's to a master's disadvantage. We don't know if there are any examples of masters who have consciously starved the elderly or the infirm, but we can affirm that the settlers do not claim to have the right to do so, and that the authority would feel obliged to intervene to prevent this atrocity. Slavery is therefore a quasi-contract which gives the slave himself rights against the owner, and limited rights to the products of the plantation he works on.

But by an exception to the common laws, an exception of which absurdity at least equals iniquity, it was forbidden to the slave to claim the very same rights that the legislation recognizes him to have, because absolute political power, without limiting measure, was bestowed upon the very ones against whom he should exercise his rights. The master is for the slave more than a judge, more than a king; he stands for him above all divine and human made laws. It is this political power that engenders outrages, punishments, crimes, and tortures of which negroes are victims; it is this political power

that corrupts whites, and which vitiates at the same time their heart and their mind; it is this political power, contrary to the proper organization of society, which creates a state within a state, which breaks the obligations of the social pact; encouraging some to insult it, and others abandoning it to the most frightful calamities.

It is the specific duty of the legislator to abolish this political power which he did not have the right to delegate in the first place, this power of man over man, while both are yet equal before the law, ahead of appropriated social powers, as they are in the face of their Creator. Another specific duty of the legislator is to preserve in the quasi-contract of slavery, all that can be most useful to the two parties between which he is intervening. The legislator must keep the master's right to the work of the negro, as he must preserve for the negro the right to work on the plantation, and to withdraw from it at will; in return for his work, his right to sustenance during illness and unavoidable rests, just as well as during work and being healthy.

That the plantation be divided into as many smallholdings as it contains negro families, may all these farms be subject to a uniform contract, to that which we have exposed in speaking of Tuscany, a contract which is moreover known in most of Europe, and sufficient guarantee of all their prior rights will thus be afforded to both parties. But the political power, the judicial power of the master, can be done away with immediately; and this without resulting for the master in any other disadvantage than that of losing the prerogative of arrogance and crime.

The plantation will continue to be cultivated by the same hands that have cultivated it before, no family will be displaced, no experience will be lost, no exploitation will not even be suspended; but the master will be able to dispense now with paying or feeding overseers and commanders. Each worker will have within himself a picker who better than any slave picker knows his own interest.

The negro will no longer just put his physical force to bear on handling the hoe, he will put his intelligence, his skill and experience into it; and with these qualities, the work at the hand, around perennial plants, is infinitely superior to that done under the yoke and automatized; the cotton plants will redouble their vigor too, and crops will be more abundant. Half of these harvests will be forming the owner's rent. He will no longer need to hurry selling his crop in order to get into his circulating capital; because he will have no more advances to make, no more wagons to repair, slaves to buy, more food and clothing to procure for them.

On the other hand, the other half of the harvest will provide the negro his sustenance to which he was entitled in his previous condition; and which must extend even into the seasons and periods of life when he is incapable of making a living. And likely, true enough, this sustentation will be more abundant than it was before, because it will not be exposed to any waste,

because a man who feels the responsibility for his own existence will be measuring his consumption within its means, especially because his work will be producing so much more now, half the yield of this work will compose a larger part for him. But in this increase in ease for the worker, nothing will be lost for the master, and quite the contrary. Agricultural prosperity can only increase with the cultivator's affection for his work, and, with his intelligence, will provide him with a guarantee of revenue and ease in realizing his fortune if he wants to sell his properties; which normally, a slave master can never boast of obtaining.

We believe it is useful to recall that in countries where sharecropping is universal, the sharecropper almost always makes an exchange with his owner; taking for himself the kind of products that are best suited to his consumption, against those whose sale is the easiest. So the negro would yield at current prices half of the colonial goods, while the

310

master would give him in return the share of the food he himself could have claimed. The cultivator's share, in fact, should not, for the most part, be brought to market; he entrusts the soil with what he thinks to need for himself. And this destination for products having a certain consumption is a guarantee against the congestion of markets; against a calamity which today affects all industries, and that of the colonies even more than any other. It is very likely that with a cultivation by sharecroppers, sugar and coffee will become less exclusive cultures; that the new peasants will think a little more about their own needs and those of consumers widespread in the colonies, and a little less about those of consumers in Europe.

It is therefore possible that the colony's export trade will decrease, as we would see decrease the export of wheat and salted pork from Ireland, if the Irish began to eat those two products themselves. We flatter ourselves that we have finally made that clear of a country. That the planters, in fact, instead of being burdened as they all are today, enjoy their revenues and find it easy to sell their estates if necessary; and that the cultivators be at ease, that the population increases in proportion to the land remaining arable, that agriculture is perfected, that consumption increases with the increase in revenue; and the colony will be prosperous, although it will cease in relative terms to produce what we now call colonial foodstuffs. In carrying out such a serious organizational change, the mother country, with the awareness of the good intentions, deaf to the local prejudices and local passions; its power must be delegated to men foreign to colonial prejudices, and firm enough in conviction to gain respect. Regardless the sacrifice, it must be prepared to reward greatly those colonists who will enter into its views, and who will voluntarily divide

311

their plantations into smallholdings; as this will be the first indications of complete success. And finally it must reserve the means to contain and punish rebellious or moronic negroes, those who would refuse to work,

and who would thus reject the good which it seeks to do on their behalf. But these means of execution are no longer immediate consequences of any principles of political economy, nor those of justice or of humanity. These fall within administrative attributions; and a man of letters, foreign to business, would be grudging to come and prescribe them to statesmen. It's no more with advice, it is with wishes that we will end this Essay and this volume, by wishing that the greatest crime which is still sanctioning the laws of Christian nations, and the biggest mistake in which their greed is still causing them to rejected any legislated mutual agreement; so that the race of men that they have caused to suffer the most, obtain from them the compensation to which it is entitled, and be brought back by them to intelligence, morality, and freedom. Human society as a whole, now finally and everywhere, effectively dealing with the happiness of the class of men on whose shoulders everything rests; and the farmer, whatever the color of his skin, having found in customs, in laws, in the sympathy of all sentient human beings, a guarantee of his ease, of his independence, and a future, of which it has been deprived for too long.

STUDIES ON POLITICAL ECONOMY

SECOND VOLUME
BRUSSELS, 1838

1

ANALYTICAL INDEX BY SUBJECTS

Page

- 1 TENTH ESSAY – Condition of the Cultivators in the Countryside
outside of Rome.
- 1 Why we return again to the condition of the cultivators.
2 We have convinced our adversaries into admitting some of our
principles; not as to applying them.
3 Chrematistics: science of means, while ignoring the end, is a
deluding science.
4 Application of our principles to a new country; Roman Campagna.
5 Most travelers love to see Rome as mourning for mankind.
6 The fact that the soil of the Campagna, no longer being cultivated
under consular directives, now remains sterile, is held preferable.
7 Deep impression of sadness encountered in Rome, upon finding it
in its current state of misery.
7 All rural populations have disappeared from the four provinces
surrounding Rome.
8 Short sketch of the ‘Agro Romano’, by the eloquent Giuseppe
Barbieri.
9 Rome's parasitic population is growing, while its resources are
dwindling.
10 Should the misery of Rome and its countryside be attributed to its
ecclesiastical government.
11 It is a government of men distinguished by their virtues or
intelligence.
12 Discontent is general, however; what are its causes.
13 The desolation of Agro Romano is an economic fact, not a political
one; ‘Latifundia’.
13 History of the Roman State’s rural population; landed property.
14 Under the kings of Rome, the fields were cultivated by inhabitants
of cities.
15 The fields undividedly belonged to the farmer; social influences of
this kind of exploitation of the soil.
16 Roman colonies, small rural properties given free to settlers.

2

- 17 All the small inheritances around Rome were sold to the rich; these
no longer do any plowing.

Page

- 18 Opulence of senators under the Empire; their torpidity; extinction of families.
- 19 Invasion of barbarians; the Ostrogoths, the Lombards; first feudal concessions.
- 20 The latifundia preserved in the Duchy of Rome; the Alberics of Tusculum.
- 21 In the tenth century, all the hill tops were crowned by baronial fortresses.
- 21 The barons turned their peasants into soldiers, but assured them of ease in peace time.
- 22 Various contracts between the barons and peasants; the 'quinta' and emphyteusis.
- 23 The useful domain of the latifundia divided into the hills; there the population multiplies.
- 25 The population wiped out again, when military careers come to a stop.
- 25 The barons renew the rural population in the hills, and in the free cities in the plains.
- 26 Rome's Campagna remains deserted, because it remained without military protection.
- 27 Culture of the plains by the townspeople during the great schism; coming to an end in the fifteenth century.
- 28 Sixtus IV tries to enforce cultivation. The sovereign has the right to regulate the use of property.
- 30 Efforts of the popes to maintain abundance; fixing the price of bread.
- 31 The condition of the plowman worsens; bankruptcy of the 'cassa annonaria'.
- 32 Official calculations on the public bakery costs. Pius VI orders to cultivate one quarter of the Agro Romano.
- 32 Official accounts of one hundred rubbi of land sown in wheat, and a sheepfold of 2,500 head.
- 34 The sheepfold, on ten square miles, maintains twenty-four people, and gives a profit of 1,900 ecus.
- 35 Miserable food and clothing of these twenty-four shepherds; they have neither houses nor furniture.
- 35 Plowing the arable part (5/6), brings in at most 30 ecus; number of workers this employs.
- 36 Division of work; daily schedule; their profits, and their illnesses.
- 37 Despite high wages, the workers are poorly compensated for their hardships and dangers.
- 38 The plowing of the Agro Romano causes a loss to the landowners, without a profit accruing to the state.
- 39 The landowner renounces the intelligence of his workers, and puts only their physical strength to work.
- 40 He deprives himself of the cooperation of nature, which greatly increases the work affixed to land.

Page

- 41 Bad air isn't bad enough to prevent cultivating the Agro Romano.
- 42 The Agro Romano would lend itself to small cultivation, as well as to improvements.
- 43 Does the sovereign no longer have anything to do, where owners and farmers are happy?
- 44 A pastoral countryside wipes out the 11/12 of gross products and wages; causes the misery of cities.
- 45 Where there are no country people, half of the trades in the towns become useless.
- 45 Where the products of the crafts aren't in demand, one cannot found a manufacturing industry.
- 46 The rural population died of misery only after being expelled from their houses.
- 47 Pius VII, in a 'motu proprio', reproaches the landowners for their harshness towards the settlers.
- 49 His wise plan to extend cultivation in concentric circles beyond each city's borders.
- 49 Its means of execution lack energy. Abandonment of any projected improvement.
- 50 Nowadays, the spirit of centralization dominates politics, likewise: the economy.
- 51 Centralization perfects things and destroys men; example: ancient Rome.
- 52 Disastrous effects of modern centralization in politics and in economics.
- 53 Centralization must produce, on all large farms, the same effects as in Rome.
- 54 France alone escapes this trend through the sales of plots of land.
- 55 The example of Rome makes us redouble our efforts to resist the torrent that is dragging us along.
- 56 ELEVENTH ESSAY – How to Resettle the Population and Culture in the Roman Campagna.
- 56 The plight of rural dwellers is an essential part of political economy.
- 57 Oppression to which the peasant is sometimes subjected; happiness that nature intended for him.
- 58 A disadvantage encountered by anyone proposing reform projects.
- 58 Humanity is only served by moving from rules to applications.
- 59 The social sciences recognize no other experience than the study of accomplished facts.
- 60 The example of Rome, ruined by the latifundia, can be used by all countries.
- 61 We must concern ourselves with the progress of those born locally, not to change the inhabitants.

Page

- 62 This rule will be deviated from in the colonies, the subject of the following Essay.
- 63 The State of Rome must be repopulated by Romans, and enriched by Roman capital.

4

- 64 The plan of Pius VII, to take advantage of the already existing population centers, is only fair.
- 64 The Agro Romano itself; its extent and its owners.
- 66 Surroundings of Rome, 'city' of Princes; horticulture; Rome's mercenary workers.
- 67 Industry abound in the small towns of the Agro Romano.
- 67 Culture of Ostia; culture of the small towns on the ridges of Monte Albano.
- 69 But its landowners only allow the cultivation of a small part of these slopes.
- 69 Around each city a small area alone is cultivated; and under which conditions.
- 70 The 'miglioramento', property of the cultivators, is worth up to twelve times the underlying raw land.
- 71 It is the poor, not the rich, who advance capital for the clearings.
- 72 Tivoli olive grove, property of the Roman barons; what they cost to plant.
- 73 The plantation is the farmer's savings bank. Removal of olive trees from Tivoli's farmers.
- 74 The harvest of olive trees put up for auction; inhabitants' misery.
- 75 Workers pushed back from the countryside into the small towns of the Roman state.
- 76 The rich, deceived by their greed, created the proletarians and the pauperism that threatens them in turn.
- 77 The heart is hardened toward the sufferings of beggars; why the beggar becomes lazy?
- 78 The character of the poor is only raised by him looking toward the future in expectation.
- 79 Danger of begging orders, since begging has multiplied.
- 80 Today the plowmen of the Agro Romano can only live in towns.
- 81 Costumes of each city, and their advantages; we abandoned them in almost all places.
- 82 Food for the poor in small towns; fraternity that maintained some local costumes.
- 82 All land improvements due to emphyteutic shares were made in the middle ages.
- 83 Leasehold shares granted in 1800 to Zagarolo, by Prince Rospigliosi.
- 85 These poor inhabitants have already succeeded in tripling the value of their land-improvements' fund.

Page

- 86 Complete social success of this experiment; but the prince is not happy, and why?
86 It is a great misfortune for the State when a province has a single owner.
87 Advantages in feudal times for the village, of an habitual residence of the lord.

5

- 88 The aristocracy, uprooting itself from the countryside, condemned itself to perish.
88 We must promote emphyteutic sharing, and reform the ownership of provinces.
89 This activity must extend from the city on land shared between its inhabitants.
90 Agrarian law: we demand for all a division of land, and respect for acquired rights.
92 Rome is already dedicated to cultivation. How now to transfer its population to the fields?
93 First grant ecclesiastical lands within a mile radius around the city walls.
93 Need to limit the scope of land concessions to what the peasant can cultivate himself.
94 Society has the right to force owners into land concessions on which its existence depends.
95 How this same system must then extend to the whole Roman State.
96 It is necessary that the sovereign authority intervenes to impose conditions for sharing land.
97 How new homes can then arise in the countryside.
99 Experience has taught us the remedy; all that's missing is the will to apply it.
- 100 TWELFTH ESSAY – Colonies.
- 100 Herein, we only propose to develop a few poorly explored questions.
101 The limits to territorial wealth anywhere, must have made one think of establishing colonies.
102 Colonies however, must be a means of civilization, not of wealth to the mother country.
102 The colonization from the coasts of the Mediterranean brought Europe its civilization.
103 The first civilized people, the Egyptians, teach their arts to the rest of the world.
104 Colonies of the Egyptians in Greece; they bring the Pelasgians out of barbarism.

Page

- 105 The Egyptians and the Phoenicians: three centuries of education, turned the Greeks into a nation.
- 105 The Greeks, in their turn, carried their colonies to all the remaining coasts of the Mediterranean.
- 106 Rome, daughter of a Greek colony, gave its own colonies a new character.
- 107 Our colonies, while even more powerful than those of the ancients, are less beneficial.
- 108 The moderns have destroyed the civilization of the countries they colonized; themselves have demoted.

6

- 109 Only the pilgrims of New England wanted to found a homeland; everyone else was looking for profit.
- 109 Settlers only seek to be loved when they feel weak amongst the natives.
- 110 The settlers of antiquity settled in cities; bonding closer as a result.
- 111 Settlers are independent spirits, but in need of a vigorous social connection.
- 112 Comparing the wild character of the 'backwoodsman', with that of the Greek colonist to whom public opinion was of importance.
- 112 In the old colonies, each plot of land was small, close to the village and well cultivated.
- 113 In modern times, with plots too large, agriculture is pushed back towards barbarity.
- 114 The Greek colonist worked with his hands, and gave all his leisure time to the country.
- 115 Equality in the Greek colonies, community of interests, power of intelligence.
- 117 Well-born and educated men, ran the colonies by their influence.
- 117 The settlers, in turn getting their cues, were able to instruct the locals and they did.
- 118 Modern settlers are not chosen for the good of the new society, but most often were repelled from the old one.
- 119 Arrived at the colony, instead of associating closely, they flee.
- 119 Penal colonies: appalling inoculation of vice into young societies.
- 121 It is now calculated that the native race must disappear before the white race can thrive.
- 121 Ancient civilization of the red race, in Mexico and Peru; subsistence in abundance.
- 122 Variety of productions, progress in the arts, knowledge.
- 123 The destruction of the red race by the Spaniards is the most appalling in history.
- 124 All cultivation in Mexico is still carried out by native populations, but their senior ranks have disappeared.

Page

- 124 It is the modern system of colonization that is the cause of these horrors.
- 125 The adventurers left the old colonies for the new ones, and their cruelties continue there.
- 126 The Spaniards go hunting for 'Indios bravos'; state of 'Indios reducidos' in the missions.
- 127 The new South American republics, by destroying the missions, extended the hunt of men.
- 128 The whites became savage again at the same time, as shepherds in South America.
- 129 Odious conduct of the Portuguese in Brazil, and in their African colonies.
- 130 In India the Portuguese pushed back civilization, and destroyed the legitimate local authorities.

7

- 130 The Dutch in the Indies did not bring any of the advances which they themselves possessed.
- 131 They destroyed the civilization of Java, and they destroyed the population on the Cape of Good Hope.
- 132 The Hottentots cultivated the land, the Dutch boers descended to the level of shepherds.
- 133 The Greeks would have civilized the Hottentots, the Dutch exterminated them.
- 134 The Dutch boers then started a war with the Kaffers, which the English continue.
- 135 The greed of the colonists varies according to the character of the Spaniards, the Dutch, and the English.
- 136 In the mainland of India, the direct domination of the English is a benefit for the inhabitants.
- 136 The English, and the Anglo-Americans in their relations with the hunters of the red race.
- 137 Their contact caused the natives to lose all the arts and all the virtues they possessed.
- 137 Crime of Europeans, by stupefying the natives with drunkenness, in all their colonies.
- 138 Australasian penal colonies; English missionaries.
- 139 The French, more than other Europeans, have been able to reconcile friendship with native populations.
- 140 The violin united the two races for pleasure, better than commerce.
- 140 The colonists of Canada were cultivators and benevolent, those of the Antilles merchants and greedy.
- 141 The entire red population in the West Indies, replaced by the blacks, and destroyed again.
- 142 Will the French know how to civilize Africa, as well as the Phoenicians, Romans, and Arabs?
- 143 In the colonization of Algeria, the duty of France is above all to

to do good for the benefit of the natives.

Page

144 'Post Scriptum': Happy results to be expected from the Treaty of Tafna.

SECOND SECTION: Commercial Wealth and the People it Supports.

149 THIRTEENTH ESSAY – The Economic Organization of Human Society.

149 Other economists want to accelerate the economy's movements, we are looking to keep it steady.

150 History does not show us that the working man has profited from the improvement of things.

8

151 Manufacturing: admirable development of human ingenuity, but who is the one who enjoys the benefits?

152 It is not the workers: their suffering in cotton factories in England.

153 It is not their masters: they're small in number and frequently find themselves ruined.

154 If it is the consumers, it is better to buy than to produce for oneself.

155 The poor do not benefit from their savings; the less their living is costing them, the less they are paid.

155 Modern inventions judged by the question: where are the happy ones, and what do they do?

156 Wonders of banks and the wealth created by credit; disasters that they cause.

158 To understand social organization, we first looked at agriculture.

159 Industrialism entered agriculture in England; the fields, just like the urban industries, improving their yields.

160 Prosperity of things, suffering for men; day laborers, farmers, and owners.

161 Abstractions that finally must be approached; pre-trade (use)value, versus exchangeable value.

162 Commerce takes no account of utility, but only of its exchangeable value.

163 An increase in the delivered quantity of commercial products may well happen without increasing their value.

164 The value of any commodity fixed solely by its sale.

164 All commerce whose goal is to 'under-sell' the competition is aleatory and produces market clutter.

165 The present suffering results from increases in quantities, while their values decrease.

166 Deception of chrematistics: which proposes to produce much at the smallest cost.

166 How from economy to economy a nation arrives not at opulence, but at destitution.

Page

- 168 Political economy is always resolved in advice toward power: what constitutes ours?
168 Maintain the right proportion between the occupations; society is based on that of the food producers.
169 Usefulness of the rural aristocracy, in what proportion should it be maintained.
171 Tradesmen: the trades were first exercised in rural families.
172 The tradesmen only carry out work which is ordered by customers.
173 Manufacturers, or those who produce commodities without knowing who will buy it.

9

- 173 How a production turns into a factory that produces commodities likely to be transported as merchandise.
174 All the savings on the factory price abandoned to the consumer by the manufacturer in a hurry to sell.
175 Suffering of the manufacturer when a delay in sales is experienced.
175 Every effort of the manufacturer tends to produce market clutter and the ruin which follows.
176 The more a manufacture grows, the more it is exposed to it; it often then redoubles its activity in response.
178 Workers of intelligence, general staff of a company, divided into hundreds of different professions.
179 Benefits spread throughout society by men of intelligence.
179 But men of intelligence are not immune to market clutter either.
180 The careers open to them cannot nearly accommodate them all.
181 Men of intelligence suffer more from poverty than others.
182 Society must educate them to their required number, so as to give all the opportunity to make their way toward success within it.
182 Society cannot survive if the ranks of its its toiling cultivators aren't met.
183 If a laborer were exempt from manual labor, all other work would become useless.
184 It is deceiving the poor, urging them to leave the plow for school benches.
185 Organization of society, and participation of all its members in achieved material advantages.
187 Malthus has shown that this participation presupposes the relation of the population to subsistence.
187 The population always increases as soon as a new livelihood is offered to it.
188 Economists feel the need for proportion, yet they are increasing disproportion.
188 Social power must watch over all society's classes, so that they only proportionately increase.
189 It must ensure that rural products do not suffer from all the hazards inherent in commerce.

Page

- 189 For what purpose it must watch over the owners, the tradespeople, and the manufacturers.
- 191 The workers of intelligence, too, belong to commercial wealth.
- 192 The true wealth of society lies in the comfort that useful labor always provides for all.
- 193 FOURTEENTH ESSAY – How do Manufactures Contribute to the National Happiness?
- 193 Our first attention regarding manufacturing concerns the fact that all their products are intended for commerce.

10

- 194 Analysis of the motives for encouraging manufacturers, and their pushing for industrialism.
- 194 Great triumphs of intelligence and human power in manufacturing.
- 196 Political economy goes astray by pursuing great quantities, rather than the useful.
- 197 Human weakness has inspired borrowing strength from powers found in nature to serve in the industrial arts.
- 198 Why did the prodigious progress in the industrial arts not change the fate of the common man in the same way?
- 198 The power of our ancestors over matter left much more in the way of monuments than ours.
- 199 We limit ourselves to the useful industrial arts, but do these really add to happiness?
- 200 Is it in the manufacturing countries that one finds abundance and leisure for the poor?
- 201 The useful arts, when exercised by the trades, are not exposed to the clutter factories produce.
- 201 The industrial arts are aroused by the demands of society, but whose time of arousal are nowhere near still the same.
- 202 Compelling demands for primal needs, barely enter the state of pleasure fulfillment.
- 203 But a worker is subject to the same constraint for the frivolous arts as for the necessary.
- 204 Greater sacrifices in manufacturing than in agriculture are endured.
- 205 Society wants above all its subsistence; then, it wants that all its work is rewarded.
- 206 Manufactures are celebrated because of offering rewards for new work.
- 206 The Foundation of Lancashire Cotton Factories; the prosperity which they spread around them.
- 207 But their competition was ruining older established factories, and especially the industry carried out in homes.
- 210 The steam engine leads to yet newer developments in cotton manufacturing.

Page

- 210 Each new invention under-sells the old ones, and drives them off the market.
- 211 Fifteen hundred thousand cotton workers; their competition reduces wages and everyone's profits.
- 211 The whole mercantile tendency of England represented by two words: 'over-trade' and 'undersell'.
- 213 We refuse to paint a picture of the current suffering of the factories.
- 214 Alternatives to excessive work and idleness in this factory that we envy in England.
- 214 The other factories resemble the cotton one: their size and their rapid decadence.

11

- 215 Abstract patterns that we are given to encourage manufactures.
- 217 What does the fear of making our industry dependent on outsiders mean?
- 218 No nation should want an industry which rewards no one except the industrialist.
- 218 It pays wages, without any benefits, to those needing to toil the hardest.
- 219 The increase in production does not give anyone more enjoyment.
- 220 The scope of the market can be unlimited; reasoning of a Scottish philosopher-economist.
- 221 The scope of the market is limited by the needs of buyers, and by their means to pay.
- 222 It is the poor, not the rich, who form the great mass of consumers for manufactured items.
- 222 When a manufacture makes rapid progress, it is at the expense of his rivals within the industry.
- 223 Error of those who expect a foreign balance of payments to be paid in terms of a numeraire.
- 224 Commerce does not consist in selling only, but in selling in order to buy something again.
- 225 Neither a merchant nor a nation could collect the numeraire without thereby incurring a loss.
- 225 But imports may not clear up exports without the numeraire increasing.
- 226 Exports to pay absentee pensions, subsidies, public loans
- 227 American trade crisis; because England withdraws the loans it had offered before.
- 228 Small capital of emigrants: any country that exports more than it imports gets poorer.
- 229 When export trade is useful: in an equal trade there is an equal advantage to both.
- 229 The manufacturing industry is forced to focus on export so as not to perish.
- 230 To save itself, it ruins the country that it floods with its products.

Page

- 230 So, despite the theory, national sentiment rejects importation.
232 Very often, English manufacturers prospered only by the sacrifice
of English capital.
233 Manufacture is not always an evil, but its rapid development is
always dangerous.
- 234 FIFTEENTH ESSAY – Protection Formerly Granted to the Useful
Arts, and What we can do for them Today.
- 234 The state of the poor classes has become increasingly critical
within an apparent prosperity.
235 Prejudices which oppose the progress of a new doctrine.
235 We have only palliatives to offer to a new but growing evil.
237 Let us begin by studying the ancient organization of those who
exercised the useful arts.

12

- 237 The trades established a fraternity between those who today are
adversaries.
238 Competition was restricted in each trade by apprenticeships.
239 Later by companionship: masterpiece, mastery and establishment.
241 The big manufacturers answer today to the big landlords.
242 How factories also had their place in the ancient organization; the
woolen arts.
243 Silk art: the advantage of this manufacture does not lie in the utility
of silk.
245 Silk, in the past, distributed abundant profits to all those who were
involved in producing it.
245 How each family saw their affluence increase by this home
industry.
246 How it offered lucrative work to women in all walks of life.
246 Changes, tried to be introduced; bigatières, bulk production.
248 The silk puller, the spinner, the weaver, and the dyer; all are
wanted to be united under one roof.
249 Today a millionaire wants to monopolize the entire silk trade.
250 Neither the number of workers, nor the value of the products, have
kept pace with the increase in silk quantity.
251 Circulating capital advanced to produce silk is time and hard work.
251 This capital takes the name of ecus, even though the person who
advances it does not have any ecus.
252 The ecus only facilitate the successive exchanges of a value which
already exists.
252 None has in ecus an amount equal to the capital at his disposal.
253 We must not think of going back to the ancient organization of
industry.
254 We have no expectation of making workers share in the profits of a
factory.

Page

- 255 We are proposing only three things: 1st: Enlighten public opinion.
256 Suspend government efforts to speed up industrial progress.
257 The inventions follow one another with a rapidity that in equal
measure ruins those they replace.
258 2nd: No longer reward inventors by granting them a monopoly.
259 The aleatory mindset is above all excited by the enormity of capital
devoted to merchandising.
260 3rd: No longer grant special privileges to rich industrialists, nor
promote their shares.
260 Also prevent fictitious capital and the like from driving established
capital out of commerce.
- 262 SIXTEENTH ESSAY – The Numeraire, Circulating Capital, and
the Banks.
- 262 Fundamental building blocks of society, such as language, etc.,
exceed in their make-up the genius of man.

13

- 263 To invent a numeraire, it was necessary to appreciate the future
relationships between men.
264 The numeraire is intended to account for the exchangeable value of
everything.
265 To compare values, one needs an ideal unit of values. An analogy
with weights.
266 Useful value is independent of work; work is measured in units of
exchangeable value instead.
267 The seller asks for compensation for the labor used up; the buyer
does not offer more than the required work anew.
267 Difficulty in finding a standard of values; why silver was chosen.
268 It represents with sufficient fixity the quantity of work necessary to
produce it.
269 An abstract unit of values, without exchanging a numeraire, is also
sufficient for commerce.
269 Primitive trade between pastoral and cultivating peoples;
enumerating values.
270 The ideal pound is used to count the valuable aliquots in the
exchange.
270 The invention of coin money divided the exchange into a purchase
and a sale.
272 The value of the commodity is susceptible to increase; that of the
numeraire is invariable.
272 Capital is the abstract image of all the values commerce disposes
of.
273 The capital of a businessman is the equity on his balance sheet;
which consists of many items.

Page

- 273 His capital is due to him in the form of merchandise, factories, receivables, and his till.
- 274 Capital is not the numeraire; it earns interest; the numeraire does not return anything.
- 275 Two circulations each in the opposite direction; of the numeraire in money, of capital in ideal pounds.
- 276 Everyone keeps less of the numeraire at home, the more secure they feel in society.
- 277 There is a lot of cash and little capital in barbarian countries; the reverse is true in civilized countries.
- 277 Confusion of capital with the numeraire; the false measures that resulted from that.
- 278 A doubled production of precious metals would upset commerce.
- 279 By pushing for mining, the usefulness of precious metals tends to be destroyed.
- 280 All the precious metal currency in the world has a determined value independent of its weight.
- 280 If the alchemists were successful, they would do more harm to commerce than the miners.
- 281 We cannot replace precious metals as pledges; only as a sign of values.

14

- 282 The assignment, the promissory note, the bearer voucher and the banknote, were all derived from the bill of exchange.
- 283 The banker relies on the public's nonchalance to attract silver coins against his paper.
- 284 At the same time, he offers to lend to anyone who asks for credit.
- 285 The bank, like the manufacture, uses a means incompatible with the end it strives for.
- 286 The bank should only replace the high-end pouches of precious metal coins; those which never become untied.
- 287 The name of a land bank alone indicates that it is operating under false pretenses.
- 287 Every bank undertakes to redeem, on presentation of its banknotes, money that it no way possesses in its till.
- 288 Effects of a 'panic' bank run; a banker's reserve, and his efforts to redeem specie.
- 289 Whatever the cause of the terror, the effects of bank convulsions worsen it.
- 290 He redoubles the search for specie; and suddenly with it, a large capital is suppressed.
- 290 Dangers for even the best run banks; false theories increase this danger.
- 291 Is the increase in its capital a desirable advantage for society?
- 292 Evidence of the overabundance, in recent companies, of capital and their disasters.

Page	
293	Borrowings of commerce from capitalists, through its deposits, current accounts, and discounts.
293	The ease that borrowers find with banks is a social evil.
295	Why are banks that induce commerce to 'over-trade', expensive for commerce.
295	Where there are no banks, do not establish any; give the monopoly to those that already exist elsewhere.
297	Private interest watches over bills of exchange much better than bearer bonds.
297	Prevent bank rivalry; circulation of banknotes too small in their denomination.
298	We can reap the advantages banking provides, without feeling the disadvantages, but the slope is slippery.
300	SEVENTEENTH ESSAY – Intangible capital, or claims.
300	From the perspective of commerce, the entire national fortune is a claim.
301	Material relationship between property and revenue; abstract relationship between capital and interest.
301	Circulating capital is the value of all marketable goods existing in society

302	In a well-regulated manufacture, only 1/50 of its capital exists in the form of a numeraire.
302	A merchant makes his investment, in receivables or in goods.
303	Balance sheet of a nation: 1. Its land and its fixed capital.
304	2. Its circulating capital, which is debt or accounts receivable, and not its numeraire.
305	3. Its furnishings, or its ongoing consumption; it is not part of its capital.
305	4. Its merchandise; a businessman strives to produce this with a minimum of advances.
306	The commodity fund decreases as commerce speeds up.
307	5. The fortune of the poor, in capital and in acquired skill, is also diminishing.
308	The material wealth of rich nations is diminishing; where is their wealth?
309	This opulence lies only in their intangible capital; does it have an existence in reality?
309	Sometimes only the negative value of claims remains, when their positive value has long since dissipated.
311	Credit is creative only insofar as it transfers to the future an exchange for the past.
311	Material wealth other than that which he transmitted in loans.
313	The value of claims remains after the capital that founded these claims is dissipated.

Page

- 313 The claim is only a claim on the product of future labor.
313 Rent is a hope, and its capital the price for which this hope is sold.
314 Public borrowing is a great injustice committed at the expense of
future generations.
315 This fortune, which is based on the future, does not enrich a nation.
316 By abolishing public funds, the nation would be neither richer nor
poorer.
316 Credit sells our children's labor in perpetuity.
317 A huge portion of society's future revenue is already pre-
mortgaged.
317 The ease and joyful existence of the poor, among peoples who are
not overwhelmed by public debts.
318 Despotism governments and revolutionary ones have found an
access to credit like all the others.
319 The very progress of freedom has diminished the safeguards
against the temptation to borrow.
320 The aristocratic senates believed themselves to be defenders of the
interests of posterity.
321 How capitalists seduce governments with their offers to lend.
322 Susceptibility of loan contractors to be fooled, and a disposition of
the public to become so.

16

- 323 Their profession is the only one which even today quickly leads to
wealth.
323 Reserve of two years of interest in the hands of the lending banker.
324 Intervention of bankers in the Spanish civil war. Are the people
involved bound to them?
325 English independence defended by loans: what they cost each
citizen.
326 Why we pointed out the deception underlying intangible capital.
327 It is up to the legislation to use this knowledge.

END OF THE ANALYTICAL INDEX

Continued from the first volume:

TERRITORIAL WEALTH AND THE CONDITION OF CULTIVATORS

TENTH ESSAY

Condition of the Cultivators in the Countryside outside of Rome

We had initially proposed not to extent our studies on territorial
wealth, further than accomplished earlier. In the previous volume, we

collected some Essays on the diverse condition in which some of the most famous peoples in history had placed their cultivators, and the effects this very condition had in restricting or increasing a general prosperity. It did not seem that a few facts worthy of observation would amount to a new exposition of basic principles, and we loved to think that we could pass to our successors the continuation of this research; that it would be them who would draw the conclusive body of doctrine on territorial wealth, or rather still on the means of ensuring happiness to human societies. It is not without some discouragement that we recognize that we have not yet made enough progress to nourish this hope. A spiritual writer,

2

in an article on the fundamentals of economic policy (Universal Library of Geneva, December 1836), says of us: "His voice was not without an echo; his teaching has benefited more, perhaps, than he thinks so himself; and the unfortunate influence of increasing production on the distribution of products nowadays, and by such on social welfare, is now an established truth in science" (1). It seems to us, on the contrary, that all that we read about political economy, and the very article that is quoted here, warn us that our voice has gone without echo: that no one repeats, develops, and applies the truths that we believe to have stated first. We realize that we have conquered more than one question, but by this we have only made the silence succeed previous clamors. We can see that our adversaries now have acknowledged many phenomena to which we drew their attention, and, while denying their significance at first, later recognized them tacitly; to then only change the ground on which to fight us. They are constantly backtracking, but think they are nevertheless obliged to reject our basic principles, pushing them back as if these were the whole of our doctrine, even though already having appropriated much of it. So the time has not yet come when we can rely on our successors to make real political economy, 'the rule of the house and community' fruitful.

We see that the distinction we have established between chrematistics, which deals with wealth like an end in itself, or as an abstract entity, and political economy which only considers it to be a means of achieving a social happiness, is starting to become admitted. We see that one of the the most distinguished writers of the chrematistic school, Mr. Nassau Senior, admits himself that he disregards human happiness in the science he delineates. "The subject of legislation", he said, "is not wealth, it is human happiness"

(1) vol. VI, p. 266.

3

The subject of political economy (read 'Chrematistics') is not happiness, but wealth. The conclusions reached by an economist of that school, some true and general as they are, do not allow him to give just a single practical tip of advice. This is the task of statesmen, and writers who have studied

legislation (1). Of course, if such silence is the duty of economists, they have hardly complied with it so far. They are never shy to offer some solution that isn't immediately applicable. Even though they have never established, or believed to have established, that a continuation of such operations did indeed increase wealth; without denouncing as false, retrograde, or as having prejudiced minds, all those who pointed out the drawbacks. Besides, we ask Mr. Senior himself, won't his coming silence on what really counts be as disappointing as the cocksure instructions of his predecessors? Does he believe that when he indeed recognizes that any economic operation increases wealth and destroys happiness, he will have fulfilled his duty to humanity by having stated only the first of these two propositions? Does he believe that when he has said: there is more to gain to act thus, not everyone will hear it as him having said: this is how to do it?

We therefore persist in looking at chrematistics, or the study of the means of increasing wealth, when disregarding the purpose of that wealth, as a very deceptive science; we persist in viewing political economy as to being the search and application of the great law of benevolence and charity that Providence has provided to human societies; we persist in offering our efforts not the progress of things, but those of men, not in the acquisition of wealth, but that of the happiness of all; and without relying on the echo that is announced to us and that we do not hear, we believe we must still raise our old voice to repeat to the nations: think well of your peasants, because they are at the same time the most

(1) *Bibl. univ. of Geneva*; vol. VI, p. 247.

4

numerous and the largest in the nation; they are the class that, through a wise political economy, can spread the most happiness; they are also the one on which greed, sometimes aided by a dangerous chrematistics, has inflicted the most suffering. Moreover, inadvertent circumstances have brought us to apply the principles that we had set out in the previous volume, to new countries that we have found to be within reach to study, and each new application confirmed their truth to us. The facts have come to order around the chrematistic doctrine, and those facts, which have been striking us with astonishment, and which workings we hardly understood; considered from the new point of view under which we have endeavored to bring back social science, all flow together and explain themselves. The link between chrematistic causes and moral effects are shown clearly, and the principles that we have stated seem to us to have acquired through this experience a new degree of certainty.

We have been called upon to make quite an extended stay in Rome, at the time when just having published our second volume on the social sciences. Thirty years had passed since our first visit to this ancient capital of the world, twenty years since the last; the impression which we received from all three was, however, about the same, subject to the changes which have taken place in the very object of our observations.

Most of the travelers who arrive in large numbers in Rome, consider this great city, not as a capital, but as the abode of a large portion of the human species, where the right to enjoyment and to human developments can be found, but like in a museum, where paintings, statues, the monuments of antiquity, and all the various products of the fine arts, are exhibited just to satisfy their curiosity. The one hundred and sixty or one hundred and eighty thousand inhabitants who live within the walls of Rome, do not seem to them but as an accessory to that curiosity. Most of them are

5

believed called to excite a visitor's imagination, to see nothing but its poetic aspect. Also they would grieve if the city of tombs, the city where successively their gaze points to the monuments and ruins of so many civilizations having followed one another, Egyptians, Etruscans, Greeks, and Romans, barbarian races who in turn conquered each other and then oppressed them, great men of the Middle Ages, and of the high priests who for a long time left their mark on all of Europe, if not to say mourn what became of mankind. To the eyes of poetic travelers, men covered in rags, who wander slowly in the streets of Rome, who warm themselves in the sun in its public squares, who, with such liveliness in their eyes and in their gesticulation, do not ever hurry, because they never have anything to do, appear much more picturesque than the free spirits of the modern cities in their homelands.

In their amateur zeal, they would rue the rags of beggars, their idleness, their misery; and perhaps there enters into this feeling a secret aversion, unknown to the very one who feels it, for this servitude, and that constant state of effort and embarrassment, to which industrialism has condemned the poor man in the modern cities. The processions of priests that we meet in the streets of all localities, are the suitable accompaniment of the three hundred and sixty churches that stand in this city long considered holy, and they preserve its character.

The very degradation of all public and private buildings, the accumulated mire in the streets, the broken cobblestones, universal neglect; the herds of oxen gathered on the walkways, with their disproportionate large horns, their haggard looks and their thinness; the fowl that wanders in freedom and fearlessness in the city of the Caesars, just as they would do in the tiniest hamlet, increase the charm that these children of the imagination find in Rome, because each of these circumstances attests to the end of the man-made empire; because each one contributes to its persuasion, true enough without reason, of the visitor along for the ride, who comes to dream between

6

these ruins, that is no longer like any other capital, and under the eyes of a suspicious and worried police.

Painters, amateurs in the fine art, and sentimental travelers admire the 'Campagna' of Rome even more, these immense deserts stretching as far

as the eye can see, which are no more traveled than perhaps by shepherds from Puglia, plowmen from Abruzzo, or a harvester from the Marche, but where we find no homes, no inhabitant born on in the region, not a trace of man's affection for the land, no human edifice which isn't at least three centuries old, and which moreover hasn't fallen into ruins. These travelers would gladly express their enthusiasm and gratitude for this soil which, despite its richness, remains sterile, as if it no longer wanted to cover itself with harvests, trees and vines, since it is no longer purposefully cultivated. Painters at the same time go into ecstasies on the warm and rich hues reflected in these deserted fields, and on the beauties they lend to the still landscape.

We have to admit, all these sensations, all these emotions are foreign to us; our defective sensitivities banished almost all the pleasures found in the Arts. We envy the enthusiasm exciting many by the wonders of sculpture and painting, but feeling it is refused to us. The rich hues of Rome, which we hear about, even entirely escape our eyes, as if beyond an infra red limit. We are more struck by architectural masterpieces; but among the ancient monuments, if some remind us of glorious times of wisdom and virtue, the greatest number and the most imposing ones are their scales of massiveness, or even by their beauty, only reiterate this opulence of the masters of the earth, who had enslaved nature, because they had enslaved man, and who did not believe that the work of a hundred thousand hands were badly employed, if it gave them the pleasures of a moment. So our evil eyes, and the accompanying thoughts, usually destroy for

7

us all the charm that seduces all other travelers in Rome. We cannot enjoy her true beauties, and we feel, perhaps more keenly than others, what we miss. As a result, Rome seems to us one of the saddest stays that we have ever known; Rome is sad for us, not only this sweet melancholy in which we would like to indulge, but because it misleads the thought far away from us, because it lifts us above humanity, whose greatness and misery we can only perceive combined from above. It's not that we don't feel this melancholy in Rome; on the contrary, it is there more than in any place in the world. But it is hardly possible for us to sense it through the spectacle of poverty, destitution, degradation, present and immediate; which affects, at the same time, such a large portion of humanity.

Between so many tombs, we see before them the beds of those dying now, we think we hear their moans; and this reality is too close, too momentary, for us to indulge, in this presence, in the reveries of memories.

The agricultural population, the rural population has disappeared in the four provinces surrounding the capital: 'Agro Romano, Sabina, Campagna maritima, and Patrimonio di San Pietro'. These four provinces, which between them cover an area of three thousand eight hundred and eighty-one square miles, do not contain perhaps even a single true peasant.

Whichever way we go, leaving from the capital, we cover at least twenty or thirty miles, and often fifty or sixty, without finding a cultivated field

by those who inhabit the area. From the sea to the hills that rise at the foot of the Abruzzo mountains, stretches the sad barrens called the plains, although the terrain presents graceful undulations almost everywhere, that, in other countries, one would call hills or mountains. The air in summer is pestilential there, without the eye being able to assign the cause, because nowhere can one see either marshes or stagnant water. The soil shows itself admirably fertile, almost everywhere one sees

8

traces of the plow, which however hardly returns to it, barely once every ten years or so; and the works, requiring sowing and harvesting, are done by strangers who come from afar, and who return after a few weeks. Campagna is of a flat surface, and covered with grasses only; while in the Patrimonio, high broom and heather partly shade the ground, extending along the sea into vast forests; and as we get closer to Umbria, large oaks seem to be planted like the trees of an orchard in the middle of the pasture; however everywhere, one would seek in vain the dwelling of a human being.

An eloquent preacher, holding Italy in the highest esteem, whose name is: Giuseppe Barbieri, described this desert, in his harmonious language, and with his tender soul, philosophically and poetic at the same time. "Imagine what it was like for me, when I saw myself before a great many miles of a vast dreary country; everything denuded and deserted by men, animals, plants; a desolate loneliness, no shelter for the unexpected disturbances in the air, no help to so many needs, which can meet frequent travelers, and neither any escape from the ferocious raids of robbers; a gloomy silence, broken only by the whistles of an erratic and disconsolate wind, and by the querulous murmurs of some reclusive source; not a strip of smoke that rises from some hidden cottage, nor, on the via Tampoco, a rustic chapel, a cross, to offer a sad comfort to an almost derelict soul. Seeing before me so much devastation, as stretched out into deep plains, as where billowing up hills of soft slopes, and as sinuously lying in comfortable valleys; that's all, and this right up to and around the walls of the magna city" (1).

To the east of Rome, at a distance which varies from ten to thirty miles, rise the hills that formerly were inhabited by the Sabines, the Eques, the Hernics, and the Albans. These, true enough, are partly covered with olive trees, vines, and fruit trees, intertwined with the fields, and their elegant

(1) Letter from Barbieri to the author, in the collection of his Works.

9

culture, which transports the soul to feelings of domestic happiness, further adds to their captivating beauty; a closer study, however, will make us recognize that there too we do not find peasants, and that the works which makes the earth productive would not be accomplished without the help of workers who arrive from outside the region every year.

Thus the destruction or expulsion of the entire order of peasants, from all the territory where Rome founded its first grandeur, in the heart of Europe, in its most beautiful climate, on the most fertile soil, is the first surprising fact, unheard of, which strikes the traveler upon arrival in the capital of the ancient civilization, in that of the Christian world, in the city which for more than two thousand years raised tributes over much of the known world.

Through these deserts, however, the traveler arrives at the superb city which looms in the distance on the horizon, and from certain directions, the dome of St. Peter strikes his sight at a distance at which all other human works still have to appear. The city of the popes, now for several centuries, continues to increase in population, in the middle of the ruin of its surrounding territory. But this parasitic population did not use to live only on the tributes that Christendom paid to his pontiffs, on the wages that the great secular or ecclesiastical lords distributed to the Churches' many servants, and to the processions of which they made spectacles, and finally on the alms that charity granted, or that duty imposed on many pious foundations. Now these three sources of revenue for the poor have dried up almost at the same time; all the sovereigns worked to restrict the tributes that their subjects paid to Rome; and when Spain and Portugal, America and the Indies cut off their subsidies, the distress was great. The noble families at the same time dismissed most of their servants, who were no longer needed to support their bickerings, as in the past; and also the impoverished convents suppressed part of their daily contributions. The population, deprived of all its former resources, not finding its means of support either the industry of the cities, or in that of the countryside

is pushed back towards ever-increasing misery; so it begs, but alms are diminishing; it suffers, but it is threatened with suffering much more yet; it is destined to perish, and already its dwellings, the porticoes under which it shelters, the cobblestones on which it crawls, merge their recent ruin with the ancient ruins on which the Rome of today had risen. The local population within the urban area is growing simultaneously with its idleness and its misery. This is the second dire economic fact that Rome presents to the traveler.

Fifteen or twenty thousand rich foreigners come each year to visit the capital of the Christian world; they are all incurring considerably large expenditures there, and it is these expenditures which now form almost the sole revenue of the Roman population.

There may not be any of these strangers who have not caught a glimpse of at least the two facts that we have just mentioned, but most are content to say that we could not expect anything else from an incapable government, from a government of priests, where no one prepared for the functions for which it remains responsible. A lightly cast reproach often hides a great harshness; we dispense with pity those we hastened to condemn, and we absolve ourselves from paying more attention to the difficulties of a task

that has already been declared incapable to be resolved by those who must fulfill it. All the sentences are already written in advance; and point to an ecclesiastical government, as misunderstanding the situation.

However when compared to other irresponsible governments, to other governments without balance and without guarantees, it is not easy to assign rational causes to its supposed inferiority.

Of course, if we asked ourselves in advance what class of men would be preferable to hand over authority to, it seems that everyone would agree to answer: to those men who have distinguished themselves by their virtue or by their intelligence. But experience has taught us that it is impossible to find in society any class which unites these two prime qualities without exception; it is not given to human nature to present an association of men pure of all vice. But it seems that among all

11

professions, that of priests should come closest to this ideal. Intended from the beginning of their education to teach morality to the people, while also constantly occupied with the study of divine laws, their relation to human laws and the teachings of philosophy; they are among all men who should know best what is right and what is honest. The discipline to which they are subjected is intended to keep them pure, and those intended to harm the consideration of the priestly body by the scandals of their life, are mostly forced to give up their status.

If these assurances introduce and maintain in the body of the Church, a greater number of virtuous men than in any other corporation, they are even more applicable to the consideration of those men being intelligent. The Church has adopted one of the two principles of democracy, the free access of all to a job, while at the same time it relinquished the other, the guarantee of the rights of the masses, or the protection due to all. Any man, born in any condition, has all the chances of achieving the highest honors and eminence in the Church, and in all its governmental powers, by the superiority of his intelligence alone. It is the political organization that has most consistently maintained this brilliant lottery of equality, which so many ambitious Frenchmen prefer to secular freedom, and it looks like the great success of the century. The Roman Church imparted no prerogative at birth, but it chose its princes, and up to the sovereign himself, within the most abject ranks of society; when the superiority of intelligence made an individual worthy of the purple, or of the tiara. Even today now so many complaints are being raised against the pontifical government, we must yet recognize that among all its servants, the more men are distinguished for their talent, the less men are noted for their knavery or their vices, that no other government anywhere in Europe comes close to.

We are however of the opinion that the pontifical government is such that the nation submitted to it has the right to demand, as it should, to gather the energy to get out of the fatal rut in which it finds itself, and to promote the material and intellectual progress of its subjects, especially as it would be necessary

to prevent them to descend ever lower on the social ladder. The discontent, seemingly universal in the population, and which finds an instrument in the mouth of all those with whom we speak, even indicates that pontifical power has lost its old prestige to public opinion, and that the latter is no longer based on prejudices or sympathetic feelings. We have said it before too: unlimited power in everything, all irresponsible power, necessarily becomes abusive. However commendable the class of men may be to whom sovereignty is entrusted, this sovereignty will corrupt, if the class owes responsibility to no one.

The pontifical government has become much worse, since the restoration abolished all provincial freedoms, all municipal charters, in short all the popular powers which limited its own. This government is alive, but as a means to provide an annuity for the old people within. We also feel that it itself has lost the hope of its duration; and which it unceasingly sacrifices what is to be done today for the next day. It is exercised by men in whom speech was developed more than the energy to act. Also it is weak and especially fearful, as fear explains more than half of its faults. And finally, priests have become accustomed to seeing themselves as the masters of morality rather than as its servants; so that they feel no need for principles, for guiding rules, for the law, with respect to human societies so as giving them the best guarantees. Roman administration in is all about exceptions, personal favors, privileges; every authority holding itself sovereign, meets rank resistance: of functions, of riches, before it will be bowed to.

It considers less what is the right thing to do, than what will not upset this or that powerful organization. But these most serious vices, which are felt throughout the ecclesiastical state, could not by themselves be causing the desolation of the suburban provinces, because they had nowhere near the the same results in: the Marches, Pérousin, Romagna, and the Bolognese; where we find a rural population that is fairly prosperous.

So it is not to the pontifical government that we attribute the appalling desolation of the four provinces closest to Rome; it goes back deeper. From our perspective, it is an economic and not a political phenomenon; a phenomenon that all the more needs to be fixed. But at the same time this fills us with a salutary terror, in that it presents itself as the end of a career that we are going through, as a consequence of our daily efforts, like the almost inevitable tomb of modern civilization. The trend of society, such as time has made it clear to us, is to constantly combine little States into a large one one, small fortunes into big, to accumulate capital, to enlarge the farms, to add some domain to another domain; and yet, the observation of facts confirms what Pliny the Elder had already been saying in a far earlier period, when the same luxury, the same accumulation of wealth, the same concentration between a very few hands of the goods that Providence had intended for the happiness of all, had also produced the dependence and servility of the many, then followed by the expulsion of farmers. In the

eyes of anyone who wants to confess to the truth, he said, it is above all the disproportionate extent of the patrimonies that first lost Italy, then the provinces. “Verumque confitentibus, latifundia perdidere Italiam, imo et provincias” (1).

Perhaps it is impossible to fully understand the state of a rural population in any country, without studying its history, and without investigating by what degrees it reached the point where it presents itself for observation. The history of the rural population of the Roman State, of this population once so numerous, so industrious and so powerful, and which today is completely destroyed, would be especially and to a high degree curious and informative. But it is infinitely difficult to find traces of the facts of which it is composed.

The transmission of inheritances from one family to another, either their fragmentation or their agglomeration almost always takes place silently.

(1) PLINII, Nat. Hist., lib. XVIII, c. 6.

14

Historiographers never mention it in their accounts, although they report on events much less important. It is true that, in charters and notarial acts, we find many of the transactions where territorial property is the object, but it is only those which relate to the more considerable estates, those which took place between lords and other great personalities. The titles of others either have perished, or have never received an authentic record; often the latter would have been more expensive than the property itself was worth. In particular, the contracts between owners and cultivators would hardly ever have been entrusted to writing.

In the middle ages, the peasant could not read, and often his lord could not read either. Also it was better, for the convenience and even for the safety of the parties involved, that both stick to verbal conventions; explained and guaranteed by the custom of the place. We will, however, try to draw a shortened picture of the transmission of property in the Roman state. But don't be in any way surprised if, for these details, we are obliged to often resort to conjecture, and then put those in the place of facts.

It is to the time of ancient Rome, and to the oldest histories of Italy, that we are obliged to go back to, to explain the state of modern Rome. In the time of true freedom, of true prosperity, and of a high population in Italy, each city nation was independent; but each could also expect war from its closest neighbors. So each nation also, more often than not, sowed its soil within the very enclosure of its walls; cultivating its fields without having to completely abandon city living. We can conclude from Livy's account that up to the year 244 BC of Rome, or throughout the reign of its kings, the suburban properties had not yet been built, and that the plowman every morning with his teams left the city and came home every evening. When the city of Alba Longa was razed, it was in Rome itself, and on Mount Coelius, that its inhabitants were domiciled; it was the same for the Sabines who were lodged in Capitol, of the Latins

on Mount Aventine and the Janiculum (1). While on the contrary the cities which transferred to Roman domination retained their farmers; and the revolution which overthrew the last of the Tarquins, who then escaped into Collatia. Guards were placed at the gates of this municipality, so that the ploughmen who lived there did not carry the news into Rome (2).

This form of land exploitation that could be called urban cultivation, not enduring isolated houses in the fields, but which unites all of them in a common enclosure, for their mutual defense and their safety, is still being practiced in many countries, in the Provence, in Spain, in some parts of Italy, and in all locations where the social order offers only insufficient guarantees. Undoubtedly it causes a great waste of time, a great expense for the transport of fertilizers and crops that we consider unnecessary; but on the other hand it has a very effective influence on the customs of the country, and on the advancement of its civilization. And most of all, the costs of such a culture hardly allows for any profits to be extracted.

Usually where it is established, the land itself belongs unquestionably to the cultivator. This was so in ancient Italy. The plowman was the absolute master of his field, he did not share any crops, he paid no rent to anyone. The Roman plowman, assured of a complete guarantee to his property, and knowing well that it would remain with his children after him, put all his affection, all his intelligence to assert that fact. The labors of the ancestors benefited their descendants, and the Roman Campagna had been so well fertilized, it was covered with such a variety of crops, that a possession of seven 'jugera', Roman acres, was more than enough for the maintenance

(1) Titi Livii: Decas I, lib. I, c. 13.

(2) Ibid., c. 23.

of an entire family. The rural tribes lived in the city like the urban tribes, but they had a dual link with the country, and this is the reason for their political preeminence. The citizens found in the cities: pure waters, shade and coolness, a distance from filth, and they exposed themselves little to this 'malaria', so dreaded today around Rome, but which however hardly affects those who, after the violent sweating of the day, brave the cool dewiness of the evening and in the morning. However, before the end of the third century, a mention is made by Livy of 'villae rusticae' (1), of houses built in the fields, where the citizens undoubtedly moved into these homes during periods of major works. The minor populations of Lazio, Sabina, Campagna, and Etruria, had all made a choice to build their city on a healthy elevated place, where the waters were pure and abundant. Their weakness compelled them to remain united in its enclosure; yet it is also probable that they avoided spreading out in the countryside, as these fields were less healthy. The normal distribution of cultures was almost always the same; they chose for olive trees, vineyards, and orchards, at the foot of the hills that crowned the city, and they plowed the fields within a

radius of four or five miles all around, while they devoted the more distant lands to pasture.

When the population of Rome increased, and when the Agro Romano was becoming insufficient for the laborers of Rome, the neighboring towns were subjugated in turn; they were obliged to give up to the victor a portion of their territory; sometimes a citizen's confederation ceded a city inclusive of the surrounding lands that belonged to it. 'Volscis devictis Veliternus ager adeptus; Velitras coloni ab urbe missi, et colonia deducta' (2). A Roman colony was sent to the conquered city. It was made up of citizens who consented to emigrate, and who obtained in sharing, free of charge, fields no less limited in scope

(1) Titi Livii: Decas I, lib. II, c. 13.

(2) Ibid., c. 16.

to what had been the original inheritances in the mother country. Their manual labor was always necessary to keep them alive, and small culture was in a way the guarantee of military vigor of these expatriate Romans; who, like garrisons without pay, kept in obedience the conquests of Rome. The foundation of colonies had at the same time appeared to patricians as a happy expedient to calm those citizens who were thrown off their old heritages. Many among them, in fact, ruined by some enemy invasion, when their fields were ravaged, or their flocks taken away, had borrowed money from the rich; which subsequently turned out to be impossible to repay. Then, crushed by the enormity of interest, and exasperated by the looming seizure of their persons (1); their resentment was calmed by engaging them for the colonies, where they were promised a distribution of free land; as long as they, at the same time, did not fail to disengage in total from any territorial property around Rome. The patricians, on the contrary, were always eager to buy whatever was up for sale near the capital. However, they had already given up working their land with their own hands, and they were cultivating these fields by slaves. But of all the ways of employing human labor, slavery is the most expensive; also, the patricians had no sooner begun to extend their heritage, that they started to look for ways to exploit them with as little human labor as possible. Soon it was recognized that around a large city, the most profitable use of land was the production of cattle, because that one requires the least labor; and that wheat, on the contrary, cultivated by mercenary arms or by slaves, is more expensive than it is worth. Later, the free distributions of wheat to the Roman people made the cultivation of grain still more unprofitable; so it became absolutely impossible for small owners to keep going around Rome, and all the rest of the small inheritances were sold to the rich. But at the same time the abandonment of all agriculture spread gradually. The true homeland of the Romans, central Italy, by the time it barely had started conquering the world, no longer had an agricultural population.

(1) Titi Livii: Decas I, lib. II, c. 13.

In the countryside, there were neither any peasants left to recruit for the legions anew, nor veterans to call up for active guard duty. Vast pastures, where a few slave shepherds herded thousands of horned animals, had replaced the nations that had been achieving their many triumphs for the Roman republic.

One of the first effects of the loss of Roman freedom was to rebuff patricians and senators from any public career. The road to the throne remained open to fortunate soldiers, but it was no longer so to those who were proud of their wealth and their birth; also, the ambition to do well had been given way to the love of luxury and pleasures. The world had never seen a magnificence equal to that of Roman senators; so much wealth lavished on the enjoyment of single individuals, so many lives devoted to satisfying, and continuing, all the whims of a man. The vastest empire that had raised human ambition to new levels depended on a small number of wealthy men. The heritage of the Romans extended from the frontiers with Germans to those of the Getulas and those of the Parthians. But cupidity increased with luxury, and died out in lethargy. These men, so proud of their birth, however, cared little about perpetuating their families; most did not get married, so as not having to share their wealth; then, dying childless, some associate collected their immense inheritance to reunite it with his. Thus, although wealth as a means to do good was decreasing in fact, the rich were getting ever richer, and because their number decreased yet more rapidly again, their estates were becoming provinces. From the beginning of the second century A.D., Pliny had said that the 'latifundia' (large domains) were lost to Italy, but that in the third and fourth Italy's possessions had become much larger still; the ruin of the empire was also more imminent however.

The almost absolute disappearance of the inhabitants of the countryside, badly replaced by a small number of slaves, opened the Roman Empire up to the barbarians. In Italy, a native population remained extant only in the most inaccessible portions of the mountains, where the Roman nobles had not cared about buying up land. Each successive invasion of barbarians dispersed, or freed slaves; and cities, with their idle and pusillanimous population, submitted to the yoke.

In some parts of Italy the barbarian invasion was also the opportunity for a new distribution of land. Theodoric compelled Roman citizens to receive an Ostrogothic interloper in his patrimony, and thereby give up a third of his estate; but the barbarian was too foreign to agriculture to be able to make it bloom again; and the number of conquerors was too small to change the mores and opinions of the population. Moreover, shortly after, the wars of Belisarius almost exterminated the Ostrogoth people in Italy. It is likely that the rural population began to settle again, though renewed in some parts of Italy, after the invasion of Lombardians. These warriors, fanatic about independence, had no sooner accomplished their conquest

when they rejected the social bond almost entirely, and began to confine themselves to their own lands. The thirty dukes whom the monarchy was divided between, immediately looked at their lands as small sovereigns. Their idea was making themselves strong rather than rich, and, in return for the land they distributed, they asked for services and not for money. The condition of the farmer became better as soon as the owners of the land looked after their men, rather than things; where they proposed to draw from the land not the greatest possible revenue, but the greatest number of valiant and faithful vassals. But this progress is foreign to the subject which concerns us here, because the Lombard domination never extended over the Duchy of Rome. The 'latifundia' of this very Duchy were therefore not yet divided. Many

20

had passed to the Church, or to various pious foundations; others were owned by patricians, or Romans, or barbarians, the emperors having sometimes distributed land to the latter as a reward for their military service. A powerful family among the Roman nobility, the Alberic, possessed Tusculum and the delicious countryside which extends to Frascati, Marino, and Grotta-Ferrata.

These family heads were called in turn counts, consuls, and senators, in remembrance of the honors they claimed that their ancestors had been adorned with when Rome was powerful. They too began to make their peasants soldiers, and it was with the sword that they enthroned several members of their family with the Roman tiara. At that time where history appears as if suspended, where all the genealogies are interrupted, we no longer can claim to know the state of the Roman countryside; there is a belief however, that it wasn't less united in immense estates, nor less deserted, in the time of Charlemagne and of Othon I, than it is today. But with the reign of the Othons, in the second half of the tenth century, began, throughout Italy, in all the Western Empire, a movement that did repopulate Europe.

'Incaluere animi' is the happy motto of Muratori, when he first shows the world in the Middle Ages, how to emerge again from chaos. The kings had finally recognized their inability to defend society by their armies, they had been forced to call on the peoples themselves to take up arms; they had allowed towns, castles, and convents, to defend themselves. So the cities raised their old walls; then the hills became crowned with castles; then, to the ruins, to the ancient Roman tombs, to the aqueducts, to the theaters, surrounded by battlements, and offered a retreat to those who could find security only in the valor of their arms, and in that of their vassals. The Agro Romano, almost deserted, had been exposed: to the invasions of the Saracens who, the year 846, plundered the Vatican, which spurred Leo IV on to surround it with walls the following year, and build the city of Leonine. A hundred years later, almost all the hills that along the horizon were crested with strongholds; the old walls, either were restored, or were built anew,

and the cities where the Sabines, Eques, Herniques and the Volscians had once defended their independence, began again to offer refuge to the inhabitants, to save their people and their property, and to inspire them with the courage to defend them. These cities however, with a more daring population, had not yet recovered their independence. Undoubtedly locked into the heritage of some family heir to the ancient latifundia, they had only become baronial fortresses. With the first lights of history in the Middle Ages, we see the great house of Colonna, settled in the towns of Eques, Palestrina, Genazzano, Zagarolo, etc.; of the Orsini, replacing the republics of Veies and Cères, and occupying the fortresses of Bracciano, Anguillara, Céri; the MonteSavelli, near Albano, also indicating the possessions of Savelli, which included the ancient kingdom of Turnus; the Frangipani were masters of Antium, Astura and the edges of the sea; the Gaetani, the Annibaldeschi, castles which dominate the Pontine Marshes, and Lazio all amounting to as many feudal families as previously existing military republics.

The military spirit of a people is always favorable however, if not to better agriculture, then at least to independence as farmers. Every rich or noble family, after the tenth century, striving to take shelter from the ravages which it had suffered for a long time, understood that its security could only be found in force. And that it was thus important to ask the land, not for revenue, but men; so that the earth be covered with inhabitants, and that they are at the same time both faithful and brave; and for that, these men have to be shown that their future is safe and in ease. Their work must be able to improve their condition. Land must be granted to them to make it valuable, in return for a sharing of the crops; which leaves the plowman with pleasures, so that he prefers industry to vice, so that he is encouraged to raise himself a family.

He also needs to be guaranteed a future, so that he can make sure that the improvements with which his sweats will enrich the earth, will accrue to himself and his family, and not to his master. The association therefore must be with him and not with the property as a substantial thing.

In Agro Romano, the most generous masters (and who thereby proved themselves the most skillful); turned over plots of their land to their peasants, for a minimal and perpetual royalty, either in money or in foodstuffs; they instituted emphyteusis or 'livelli', and they only attached to it the condition of military service.

The most avaricious, on the other hand, wanted both to reserve more for the present, and not to let go of the future. They imposed on settlers the condition of granting them only a fraction of the crop, and they reserved the right to set conditions anew every year. But the land they conceded to them was bare and deserted, and instability of tenure renewal prevented that it would be improved. The plowman, just to get a single harvest, was

held to devote considerable and expensive work to it. His own gains were petty so that he could hand over a large share to the owner.

Some had to be satisfied with a fifth of the produce, leaving four-fifths to the owner. In no way would such sharing ratio leave sufficient reward for the plowman. When he has no olive trees, no vines, no fruit trees, no fence, no dwelling for men and livestock, no irrigation or drainage canals, and no hereditary improvement; agriculture, without a future and without a past, is an unprofitable industry. We still see today some fields kept at 'quinta' (for the fifth); but even when the fields are fertile, the plowman barely makes a living at that share of the product.

The cannon of the emphyteusis had been set lower still. Often, except for military service, the fee was only nominal. The scholar trounces Coppi, in his dissertations:

23

'On the places once inhabited and now deserted in Agro Romano'; only one of these ancient contracts has been preserved for us, it is from May 11, 1202. We can see that the abbess of S. Ciriaco granted her tenants a farm which covered part of the territory that were occupied by the two ancient Latin cities of Amériola and Médullia, against a royalty of one and a half barrels of olive oil, three pounds of wax, one pound of incense and twenty silver sols. But she also reserved herself, according to the custom of the place, the seventh and the thirtieth of the inheritance of any peasant who died on her domain (1). Otherwise, the long-term cultivator had perpetuity ahead of him; so he worked tirelessly to found the wealth of his family. He worked his hills in terraces, he covered them with trees, shrubs, and all the products that love and intelligence can accumulate in such a narrow space of ground; he took advantage of all his moments, of all those of his wife and children; for each he found an occupation commensurate with their strength. He lived in abundance, and he raised around him sons ready to handle the spade under his orders, or the sword under the orders of their lord.

Whenever one climbs the volcanic hills of Lazio, whenever one visits these lovely sites that painters have amply illustrated, around the lakes of Castel-Gandolfo and Némi, in Genzano, Larriccia, Rocca di Papa, Marino, Frascati; every time one will meet up with a riant culture, intelligent care, and an abundance of the produce of the earth, one can be assured that the grower is in the possession of or had possessed some emphyteusis. Bare property belongs to some lord who receives an invariable royalty from it; But the useful domain, or, as it is called in Rome, il 'miglioramento', the improvement, is the perpetual property of the cultivator.

With the help of this association of the peasant with the property, the extent of the domains in the hills ceased to have the ruinous effects that it had in the plain; the 'latifundia' were

(1) Mem. dell'Acad. Romana, del 4 luglio 1833, p. 209.

truly divided; the royalties that the peasants owed to the lord did not prevent them, any more than those they owed to the sovereign, from looking at the soil as theirs, and to enrich it with all their labor was worth. Agriculture made to be born in these districts is also conducive to a large population, which indeed multiplied with a singular rapidity; and which does not only provide cultivators and defenders of the mountains of their birth, but adventurous soldiers too, ready to shed their blood in all the wars of Italy. For, since the middle of the fourteenth century, the Roman nobles, and more particularly the Colonna and the Orsini, distinguished themselves by their courage and their military talent, and by the progress which they made to the art of war. Each of the fifteen or twenty illustrious commanders produced by the Colonna house, when appearing out of his mountains, was always accompanied by a band of adventurous warriors who devoted themselves to his fortune. The strongholds of the Roman nobles, in the mountains, were then, like Switzerland, a nursery of soldiers that were sure to meet on all the battlefields in Italy and beyond. The Orsini, no less valiant than the Colonna, saw certainly, in the Middle Ages, their fiefdoms covered with a population no less flourishing, for they too raised a number no less large of adventurous soldiers, who followed them into the kingdom of Naples, where they distinguished themselves by preference, in Tuscany, Lombardy, and as far as France. Renzo da Ceri, who defended Marseille in turn against Charles V, and Geneva against the Duke of Savoy, made famous beyond the Alps the name of this town of Cères, today a sojourn of the saddest desolation. But one would look in vain in all the strongholds of the Orsini for the remains of this population which, three and four centuries ago, stood out in arms. Their castles are ruined, their fields are returned to the desert; either because their stronghold wasn't strong enough and they suffered more from the war, or that the population, in part of several villages that were massacred when the duke Valentino (César Borgia) wanted to annihilate the Orsini,

never recovered, or finally because the lords, not any longer needing men for the war, only showed themselves more greedy; and they subsequently stripped their peasants of their privileges. For they realized that grants, even perpetual ones, could be resolved, in a political state where justice belonged to the lord concessionaire; and where the very one who wanted to drive out the settlers, because he did not want more soldiers anyway, was the final judge of the contracts made with them. Several other parts of the Roman state present the same contrast between the memories of a bellicose prosperity in the Middle Ages and their present desolation. One would seek in vain today around Astura the men whom Frangipani gathered without difficulty under his flag, to arrest the unfortunate Conradin; in the forests surrounding beautiful Lake Vico, the human race has almost disappeared from there, as the soldiers with whom

the sinister prefect of Vico so often made Rome tremble in the fourteenth century, did not allow for descendants. The desolation of Ronciglione and Castro and in contrasts with the much more recent opulence and military glory of the Farnese house which has emerged from it. Everywhere the same fact is represented: when the lords asked the land for men and not money, their liberality was rewarded, and they got both money and men; when then they asked the land to produce money, regardless of men, their greed had them deceived, and they no longer obtained either men or money.

It's because agriculture wasn't wisely encouraged by the feudal nobility, other than when it offered resources to the art of war; that, in the Middle Ages, the population did not begin to renew itself other than in the hills and mountains. The lords wanted soldiers, but it was on condition that these soldiers were theirs; it seemed to them rather useless to grow wheat that they could not defend and keep men who would not obey them. The free cities proceeded in another way;

26

when they were populous and powerful, wherever the road was open to their 'carroccio', to their chariot with its waving banner mounted on top, they felt able to protect their 'contado', or district, and then agriculture indeed flourished in the plains surrounding them. Weaker cities, on the contrary, and the free communities, which were called 'castelli', at the time, cultivated the plains with less confidence and concomitant assiduity; they avoided building either villages or houses there. These rich lands were only sown when the peace was believed to be stable enough to bring in the harvests. Otherwise they preferred, with good reason, to use them only for grazing. Open fields did not provide sufficient security for them to undertake the considerable works of agriculture; without which they could neither be prepared nor controlled. It is for this reason that in Tuscany, the unsanitary swamps and plains, which industry didn't conquer until the reign of Peter Leopold, remained deserted too during the highest prosperity of the Florentine republic.

The same causes condemned the Agro Romano to desolation, or the entire stretch of rolling plains that extends from the foot of the Umbrian and Sabine mountains to the sea. Although fever almost every summer attacks the unfortunate people, who come from afar to sow and harvest the fields that are scattered there, the country is not at all swampy. And with its soil being wonderfully fertile, it would be susceptible to the finest culture; but up to the middle ages, it was not susceptible to defense. A plowman could certainly have sown these plains; but what guarantee could be given to him that the harvest would be there? Olive trees, fig trees, mulberry trees, vines, could have been planted; ditches dug, plots surrounded by hedges, rural houses built (because there is nothing in the nature of the soil that repels small cultivation, it can only be politics or large agriculture that can prevent exploitation of the soil to be great). But small cultivation counts on a secured future, and Rome, which claimed to have eternity in its grasp,

took little care of the future in this world. The popes, in the middle ages, ambitious and timid both

27

at the same time, were constantly engaged in conflicts that they did not know how to resolve. To do the fighting for them they provoked in turn either the great feudatories, the kings of Naples and the dukes of Milan, or even loosely organized mercenary companies; and, after having them declare some war, they let them ravage the country, without restraint or oppose them with resistance. Defense oriented urban militias inspired the sovereign pontiffs with more fear than confidence, so they tried to keep them disarmed; and although the population of Rome was numerous, its 'carroccio' never went out into the fields to protect them. Also the lords and the pious institutions to which these open territories belonged, did not show any eagerness to settle some population; they did not grant 'livelli' or emphyteusis; they allowed some foreign cultivators to come in and work them, paying the 'quinta', but they did not advance anything, they gave them no protection, and they let them go without regrets, preferring the soil's product to be natural grass, whose pasture they leased, and for which they ran no chance to a dubious prosperity, which could be a bait for their enemies.

It is probable, however, that from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, a number of Rome's inhabitants began to cultivate Agro Romano again, as it had been cultivated in the early days of the Republic. That without actual settlements in the fields, which they had taken off either the rich lords or pious foundations, some plots of their vast properties and operating them under conditions unknown to us. We must conclude, either from the state of the markets, either that of the poor, or of later testimonies. The wheat trade was often carried out with insufficient capital, it aroused too much mistrust, frequently it was interrupted by war, large cities would expect to derive all its subsistence from it; it was necessary then that the Roman population largely fed on wheat harvested on its territory. Furthermore, during the stay of the popes in Avignon, during, the great schism of the West, the tributes of Christendom ceased to reach Rome; the

28

distress of the papal court was extreme then, and that of the people was greater still. Rome's population greatly diminished, true enough; but still, whoever remained had to live. And as its citizens were unfamiliar with urban industry, as no jobs were to be found in any workshop, poverty must have led the people back to seeking work in the fields. The schism ended in the mid-fifteenth century however, and as soon as Roman lords began to enjoy some opulence again, they figured on taking back from the colonists the fields they had been putting into culture. An edict from pope Sixtus IV (1471-1484), vigorously restated by pope Clement VII, in 1523, instructs us of a later reaction: "Considering," said Sixtus IV, "that the frequent famines to which the city was exposed lately, were mainly due to the small

number of fields that are seeded; and that the lords prefer to keep them uncultivated, and to destine them only to pasture cattle, rather than to improve them and thus allow them to be cultivated for the food of men, because they assure us that they withdraw in this way a greater profit," etc. (1) So, from the middle of the fifteenth century, the large landowners among whom the entire Roman countryside had always been divided, refused to cultivate their own land, and they successively overthrew any settlers who had tried to plow them. Sixtus IV, to preserve the prosperity of the public from the effects of lord's greed, ordered that a third of their land was to be cultivated each year.

In order to guarantee the execution of this ordinance, the Pope authorized all those who wished to cultivate the neighboring land of Rome, and who could not obtain permission from the owner, to go to court. These were to decide then on the choice of the third of the patrimony which should be subjected to the culture, on the time of the clearing and on the royalty that the farmer would pay to the owner for the use of his land, as well as all the difficulties that

(1) Nicolaï, dell 'Agro Romano, vol. II, p. 30, 31

could arise on this occasion. Sixtus IV and his nephew, Julius II, were both too feared as pontiffs for the Roman barons daring to make a claim against this ordinance; but when Clement VII tried to put it back in force, it met with strong opposition. A discourse by Baptiste Casali, addressed to this Pontiff, in which he outlined everything that the owners had to suffer from these arbitrary measures, has been preserved for us.

Nor is it just from those old men, accustomed to a blind obedience, that we would like to borrow for examples of legislation; but when they believed they had the right to subject the property to rules onerous to the owner, for the greater good of all of society, they started from a principle common to all peoples to this day, and the application of which can be found in all the civic codes. It's from our time only that English publicists have begun to say that property preceded the institution of society, and that the latter was only formed for the defense of this same property. We cannot conceive, on the contrary, what a property is prior to instituted law and to public enforcement of it; property that the law has not guaranteed and that public force does not protect, cannot exist. But this question of theory is less important than that of fact; in all times, as in any country, the sovereign power has set out limits to property, according to what he believed the advantage of all to be;. But whenever he did so, he listened only to the owners; society as a whole has been shortchanged, and the owners at best equal one another. Roman history from its origin to the present confirms this truth in every century. As for the edict of Sixtus IV, its greatest flaw was being able to too easily to be evaded. The Roman barons, powerful in their lands, powerful in the courts, soon found a way to ruin all who tried to cultivate their fields in spite of themselves. Under the pretext of needing the wheat for themselves, they forbade plowmen to bring it into the city,

they then quibbled them over payments, exhausted them by legal fees, and they ended up forcing

30

all farmers to leave all their fields fallow (1).

Having failed in their efforts to cultivate the Roman Campagna again, the popes in the seventeenth and eighteenth century endeavored at least to maintain the abundance in the markets, and to prevent complaints from the people if they ran out of bread. Once again the aim seems honorable and legitimate to us, and it's not because legislation imposed an inconvenience or privations on the owners that allows us to blame the legislator, but only because the intended goal of the edict was never reached, that it sacrificed the future for the present moment, and that by wanting to have food for the people, it compromised those who fed them. Pope Paul V, who reigned from 1605 to 1621, instituted the 'Cassa annonaria' part of the apostolic chamber, which he charged exclusively with the direction of the supplies from Rome; and the latter, proposing above all to avoid the discontent and seditions of the people, ordered that regardless the harvest, or the scarcity or abundance of wheat, the price of bread sold at certain public bakeries would remain at the same price, namely a baioc or Roman sol, one tenth higher than the sol of France for an 8 ounce bun. This uniformity price has been maintained for almost two hundred years, and even today one still pays a baioc per bun; although the weight of this bun varies somewhat. As a result of this rule given to the bakery, the apostolic chamber soon found itself obliged to take possession of the wheat trade without sharing; not only did it buy everything the countryside produced, but it granted or refused permissions to import or export. It exercised, by doing this, that its power is ensured, not according to the conveniences of the market, but more so according to the credit or the liberality of those who requested the exemptions. Even leaving aside this ill-use of power, the rule that is being followed here, not to consult other interest than that of the poor consumer, is a bad one, because it is as biased as the contrary rule

(1) Nicolaï, dell 'Agro Romano, vol. III, c. XII, p. 64.

31

recommended today, to consult solely the interest of the producer or owner. The government, we believe, must watch over the distribution of subsistence, but it must do so in the interest of all, not in that of any of society's classes. The lack of principles of the apostolic chamber, the arbitrariness of its decisions and the impossibility to foresee any outcome in advance, made it much more annoying than the original condition of owners who had their fields sown in the Agro Romano.

Whatever the abundance or the scarcity of wheat, the apostolic chamber passed them to the bakers at the rate of 7 Roman ecus (37 fr. 10 c.) the rubbio, a measure that weighs 640 kg. This price did not deviate much from the average, and it left the bakers a sufficient profit, when they sold

their buns for the price of one baioc; and until the year 1763, the profits chamber made up for its losses. But around this time an increase in the price of wheat began, which continued until the end of the eighteenth century. Despite its losses, the dreaded apostolic chamber, always inclined to give rise to popular discontent, continued to sell bread at the same price. Also, when in 1797 the pontifical government was overthrown, the 'Cassa annonaria' of the chamber had a deficit acquired of 3,293,865 ecus, or 17,457,485 fr. (1).

Long before the sparkle caused by the revolution, the apostolic chamber had felt however, that the system it was engaged in was bad, and it had multiplied the inquiries to get ready to replace it with a better one. From the pontificate of Benedict XIII, commissioners had been charged, in 1729, to ascertain the price at which bread came to bakers. Public ovens had been delivered to them free of charge, all the manipulations were done in their presence, and all their calculations are reproduced in the work of Nicolai. Other tables were made with care, regarding the quantity of wheat which should have been sown annually and of that

(1) Nicolai, dell 'Agro Romano, vol. III, c. XX, p. 153.

32

which was actually sown; the population movement of Rome, and its year over year wheat consumption; costs of transportation; and finally, how much the cost of wheat increased according to market prices. It was in accordance with all these data points that Pius VI, in 1783, made up a new cadaster of the Agro Romano, and imposed on its owners the condition of sowing 85.000 acres of land per year. The order of Pius VI, however, was never executed; barely 25-30.000 acres of land were sown. The owners and the farmers both refused; the first demanded that in addition to the rent, the farmers gave them two rubbrios (1280kg) of wheat for each rubbi of land (5 acres) they would cultivate (1).

The owners finally clearly explained the reasons of their resistance to the progress of culture; in 1790, they presented two figurative accounts, which they confirmed in 1800, and which are still true today. One account made known the cultivation costs and products of 100 rubbi of land sown with wheat in the Agro Romano; the other those of a flock of 2,500 sheep under the same circumstances. Their result shows us that, while the cultivation of wheat would hardly yield, on an advance of 8,000 ecus, a profit of 30 ecu for the cultivator, or rather the farmer, and further assuming the season was favorable, this same advance of 8,000 ecus, devoted to a flock of sheep, would gain him approximately 1,970 ecus (2).

These figures of the two accounts are of the utmost importance. For they explain the constant, invincible resistance evoked by the landowners and farmers; that in Rome are called:

(1) Nicolai, dell 'Agro Romano, vol. III, p. 133.

(2) Ibid., vol. III p. 167 et seq.

‘mercanti di tenute’, estate merchants, to the progress of culture. This puts in all its glory the opposition between the social interest, that of the large landowners, and the interest of the State, into an overall perspective. It shows that the real economy, ruled by the first, the one that truly enriches, it is the political economy of human lives; it also involves the suppression of the inhabitants on all the territories which they possess. And finally, these gave the authentic details that we took care to confirm, as still being true today; on this minimum of workers to which the landowners and their tenants succeeded in reducing the social benefit of the Roman countryside, and on the minimum of pleasures they forced society to be satisfied with. However these accounts, filled with technical words, in use only in Rome, would be unintelligible for most readers; and we will comment on them in general, rather than reporting them verbatim. The first basis of both counts is the evaluation, at 1 ecu per acre of land, of the value of the grass, that the land used for grazing produces naturally. This sum, equivalent to the rent paid to the landowner, becomes part of the fees in either account. It seems that it is regarded today as rather superior to the average; because, if the mows, mowed nowadays by sheep, are estimated to be worth up to 10 ecus, these same pastures that are plowed every four years are barely worth four ecus; those who stop plowing, and whose land, as a result, soon becomes covered with brush, are not worth three. Indeed, the farmers that we consulted claim that they always lose on sowing a wheat crop. But this culture is necessary for them to prevent the soil from being invaded by brush, and thus made unsuitable for grazing.

The comparison is not established between two fields of equal extent, but between two equally dedicated capitals, one to plowing and the other one to pasture. The second one highlights a worth ten to twelve times the size of the first land. The flock of two thousand five hundred woolen animals, to which is tied another herd of twenty-six horses or mares, spend thirty weeks during the autumn, winter, and spring, in the plains of Rome, and twenty-two summer weeks in

the mountains of Sabina and Umbria. For its winter food it requires about thirty-five hundred acres of land, and about twenty-five hundred for his summer food. The herd gives life to twenty-nine people in winter, eighteen in summer, who, with only twenty dogs are required to maintain it. It's an average of twenty-four people for an area of ten square miles, given over to pastoral life. Indeed, these are the only inhabitants to be found in these deserts; which compare to other parts of the papal state that are having at least two hundred inhabitants per square mile, and some much more.

The conversion of arable land to pasture is equivalent to the suppression of ninety-nine inhabitants out of a hundred and the profit of the farmers, or rather that of the land speculators, who in Rome are called ‘mercante di campagna’, represents a part of the maintenance of these ninety-nine inhabitants out of a hundred, that they prevent from making a living.

But this operating system does not only save on human labor, it does not only reduce to a minimum the number of those who work the land and are supported by it; it further subjugates workers to privations, bringing their lives very close to savagery, while just about absolutely cutting them off as consumers of city-made industrial products. The table we are studying tells us that the shepherds' wages are, on average, 10 ecus, or 53 francs for the winter season, and just about as much for the summer season, although this is much shorter. But the flock's owner is, in addition to that, bound to provide: twenty ounces of bread per day, half a pound of salted meat per week, the equivalence of two glasses of olive oil per week, and a little salt. This allows them to make use of sheep-milk solids for cheese making; but no wine, vinegar, piquette, or fermented drink of any kind is extended to them. Such is the food of the shepherds throughout the year. It is brought to them entirely from Rome; because there is, in all the expanse of the wilds, neither an oven nor a housewife

35

to prepares a meal, nor a vegetable garden that would provide some kind of plant for cooking. The garment of the shepherds is as miserable as their food; we recognize them from afar, in sheepskins, with the hair outside, which covers their shoulders and thighs; below, they wear but rags. There is no question of accommodation. Most often they sleep in the open air, or at best in some of the old ruins with straw put on the floor, in some natural cave of these volcanic lands, or some opening of the catacombs. It is also in the latter that they store the pots, the spoons, pouches, and all the paltry utensils that only are a must for this operation, and whose account is given to us carefully. The total value of those, required for these twenty-nine people only, comes to 30 ecus, or 159 francs. All the expenses of the twenty-nine herders attached to this sheepfold, including wages, supplies and the small number of tools for their use, do not amount to more than 1,038 ecus. The products consist of lambs, old sheep being culled, wool, cheese, ricotta, and twelve three-year-old foals that are likely to be sold each year. The total of these products are rated at 7,122 ecus, and the annual profit in the account comes in at at 1,972 ecus.

The other table, which relates to an operation of same value, but at an expanse of land ten or twelve times smaller, does not give us as good an idea of the state of the men who make a temporarily living off the soil. Plowing, as we have said, is a speculation in the Roman Campagna where there is more to lose than to gain. The harvested wheat rarely covers the costs, and it would have been renounced long ago there, if it was not necessary to resort to it after a few years; to purge the land of brambles, broom, heather, and all the shrubs that would make it unsuitable for grazing. As this wild growth has made it a desert, where no longer a single inhabitant is to be found, when the farmer, the 'mercante di campagna', wants to plow it, he is obliged to call his workers from far away; and it suits him better too, for the encouragement they give to one another, and for ease of inspection, to

have them all working at the same time. It is not uncommon to see up to a thousand reapers at a time, sickle in hand; with overseers on horseback, who press them on. Because of this large number of workers, the division of labor is effective among them to a degree unknown in other countries. In a brief given to us on the work required for the cultivation of wheat, we find at least ten classes of workers, whose names we cannot do any justice to in any language; in almost any other country their various works would have all been carried out by the same person. Some of this work is done by day laborers who descend from the mountains of the Sabine; with others coming from Marche or Tuscany; and the largest contingent consisting of Neapolitan subjects who come mainly from Abruzzo; and finally, for the arrangement of the straws and the construction of sheaves, idle people are found in public places of Rome ('piazze di Roma'), which are hardly fit to do anything else.

This division of work made it possible to adopt the most careful methods of agriculture; the wheat is weeded at least twice ('mondarella' and 'terra nera') and sometimes more. And, with each having practiced a particular operation, he does it quicker and with more precision. Almost all work is done on a contract basis, under inspection by a large number of agents and sub-agents; with the farmer always supplying the food, impossible as it would be for the worker to get it in the desert. He also gives everyone a measure of wine, the value of 40 baiocs of bread a week, and three pounds of some other nutritive substance, like salted meat, or cheese. The winter workers go to sleep in the 'casale', a large building, entirely devoid of any furniture, which is the center of a huge exploitation. They often have two three or four miles to go there, but they get there after dusk. In summer, to

the contrary, they sleep at the place of work; most often in the open air, even though an abundant and icy dew is the main cause of their illnesses. The most careful among them bring tents, or build huts of foliage. The campaign of the harvesters usually lasts only for ten days; and their entire wage, or about 5 ecus, is generally saved and spent at home. Workers of various classes who thresh the grain, transport, and store it, are kept on longer in the Agro Romano, and although paid at a higher wage, it is rare that they can put as much money aside, because of them being more exposed to diseases. In the best years, a third or a quarter of these workers suffer from fever; in the worst, almost all. Even in the winter, and in the healthiest seasons, the price of farming work is high; it varies from 20 to 25 baiocs; in summer, we have it seen to rise to 9 'paules', or very close to 5 francs. This high cost of labor is a sufficient explanation as to why the plowing in this rich countryside is unprofitable. But however high these wages may be, they hardly make up for the dangers and privations to which the poor workers expose themselves. Most have a trip of two or three days to make, to arrive from their home region and to return there. Their work, which begins at sunrise and lasts until dusk, has two breaks of

an hour to take their meals. It happens under the suffocating ardor of a scorching climate, which ever exposes them to insect attacks. For their rest, while bathed in sweat, they lie down on the bare earth; and even under the shelter of foliage, it is still always pernicious. If they fall sick, they are far from their homes, families, and from all those whom ancient habits would induce to give them care and affection. Some of them are then are transported to hospitals in Rome, others try to drag themselves to where they are from; several die in the journey, survivors are until the end of their lives condemned to a miserable existence. The few ecus that the most fortunate

38

manage to bring to their home country operate like lottery prizes, enticing others to run the same chances, but the wages offered to traveling workers are, on the whole, a calamity for the country from which they come. But the country they come to cultivate, what benefit does it derive from their presence? None other than the farmer's gain, and this gain, as we have seen, is almost zero; or, even more often than not it gives way to loss. While it is true that, for a crop of one hundred rubbi (500 acres) of land, the farmer distributes 4.320 ecus in wages, according to the account we have in front of us; that's more than four times what it costs him in the wages of a sheepfold of two thousand five hundred sheep which would yet occupy ten times more land. However, although the aim of agricultural work must be to provide a living for men, this goal is not fulfilled if they are made to live miserably. It is even less so if this agriculture does not settle inhabitants where the jobs are. Roman plowing only changes the face of the desert for a moment, it does not locate people to live in the countryside; and it therefore does not prepare a market for the industries of the city. Workers who will have come to brave the fever from afar, will leave after ten or twenty days, often without having seen Rome itself, and always without having shopped in the place where their wages originated. Rome has no real countryside with country people; the fundamental trade, upon which all others are based, that between the city and the surrounding fields, could not exist there.

The response presented by the 'mercanti di tenuti' to Roman pontiffs, in its drawing up of their two tables, therefore preempts a possible solution: plowing, as practiced around Rome, is always less profitable than pasture, and the more often it is exercised the greater the loss will be. So there is no reason to extend it, except in as much as this pasturing itself requests weeding. But between this once in a while plowing for the great landlords, and real agriculture, the one that uses the earth to provide men with food and happiness, even more so than wealth, these are worlds apart. Among the entrepreneurs of rural works in the Roman state,

39

those we call 'mercanti de tenute', or 'di campagna', there are men who have a very great fortune, who received a distinguished education, and

who probably will not take long to acquire all the land they could exploit; they are barely eighty in number. The most sophisticated tricks in the field of agriculture are known by these men. They have the sciences, the arts, and an immense capital at their disposal; they know how to benefit from all the advantages of centralization, scrupulous accounting, inspections that they extend to everything, using their staff of 'fattori' and 'fattorini'. But they live in Rome, and one cannot ask them to know in detail the five or six immense domains that they make valuable at the same time, and that from time to time they visit rapidly on horseback. Except them however, all those who contribute to Roman agriculture are hired men, non of whom having a vested interest in the success of the enterprise. The owner or the farmer who wants to make use of his land by economy, as it is expressed; that is to say with servants or workers that he claims can be directed, while not doing any work himself, is depriving himself of their intelligence and their affection for work, and is exploiting only their physical strength. It is the moral and intelligent part of man which makes him valuable, and not the vigor of its muscles. Moreover the real and only profitable economy in agriculture, is to have the work carried out, thus doing the actual plowing, by those who benefit from it; if it is possible by an owner, or, to default, a tenant under perpetual annuity, or finally, failing either one or the other, a sharecropper; because the work managers who regard themselves as above fatigue and day-to-day details of agriculture, will be ruined if they employ day laborers; and will ruin the country if they leave them idle altogether. The workers that the 'mercanti di tenute' employ for growing wheat cost them more than they are worth, not only because it is fair to pay them, aside from their trip, compensation for the loathsome lodgings they will have to put up with, and for the chances of illness

40

to which they submit themselves, but also because the worst characters from neighboring provinces are the only ones who will resign themselves to lead this nomadic life. Unidentifiable to their masters and their fellow workers, they have no reputation to acquire or maintain, their only interest is their own; which is the opposite of that of the master who is employing them. It would be indifferent to them whether sowing salt or wheat in the earth, and they would have no regrets if the fields were ravaged by fire from heaven at the moment they are done and got paid. The work of these same day laborers costs even more than it is worth, because in the Roman Campagna, the present generation does not inherit any of the work done by previous generations, because it does not benefit from the power that nature slowly bestows to fructify the work of man. This power caused a great tree to grow where, by maybe five minutes of work, a hundred years ago, a man placed the seedling of a fig or an olive tree. Indeed, the land which satisfies man with its fruits, the earth, which under this same pontifical government in the Marches supports more than two hundred inhabitants per square mile with all the pleasures of life, has been enriched by an immense accumulated capital. But this very capital

represents just as much the extended work of nature, as that of man. The ground was broken up to two or three feet deep, but then its elements were mingled and softened by the beneficent action of time. The vine, fig tree, olive tree, mulberry, all fruit trees

41

which are there now, owe their plantation to man, but owe their growth to nature; man's terraces, aqueducts, drainage canals, fences, preserve the land and its fruit from unfortunate influences, and spare the work of new generations; housing, distributed over the entire surface of the ground, not only assure the pleasures, the rest, the health of farmers, but they save them tiring and unnecessary transport to markets. The variety of crops which follow one another serves as a guarantee that all will not perish by the same bad weather; the works these require are distributed among all seasons, and the cultivator who wants to do everything by himself knows how to reserve a profitable work for every day of the year, instead of him asking for a wage during the sowing and harvest days, to feed him charity in the dead seasons. Food arises from the soil; it comes, proportionately to the needs of the cultivator into being; and it is not put on the market, like the effort of the plowman of Rome, to buy bread, drink, and even the smallest celery stalk he would like put in his soup.

But we may say that bad air, 'malaria', does not leave any choice to the Roman farmer, and that it showed his ability to take advantage of his land under such dire circumstances. The traveler who questions the Romans can't help but be struck by how much, for the most part, they deny the existence and dread of 'malaria'. And while it isn't true they are claiming that disease isn't incessantly saturating the atmosphere over these sorry fields; they say that's an effect, and not not the cause of this desolation. The air in the vast pastures is unhealthy, they say,, because of the abundant dews that these cause; it is unhealthy because of the earth being opened up after a long time of dormancy; it is unhealthy in fields where no attention is given to proper drainage, where sources of water thus form pestilential pools; it is unhealthy where a pure spring is not reserved for human drink, where his abode is chosen without any attention to proper hygiene, where his diet, reduced to bread and salted meats, is never varied by including

42

fresh vegetables; where insects multiply without hindrance, biting flies and mosquitoes are plentiful enough to set blood on fire and make life unbearable; finally, where man is deprived of all the comforts of home and household, all the attentions that his wife and the members of his family would lavish on him. It is certain, in fact, that the savannas of America, and all the clearing that is going on there to attempt cultivating that virgin land, presents the same chances of developing fever as that in the Roman Campagna; that the progress of culture always encounters bad air ahead of it, just like it is certain that looking back, no bad air was noticed until the population disappeared. It is certain that several of the most poorly located

neighborhoods in Rome, are the healthiest because they are also the most populated; that nowadays Grosseto in the Tuscan Maremma region has been cleared, by industry and the population, from its most pestilential air conditions too; that the ruins of the Roman 'villas' on the banks of the Tiber, and on the shores of Lavinium, Laurentium and Asture, attest to the fact that the Romans were going to seek pleasures and fresh air at the sea, where today we would only find death.

But without solving the question, without deciding if the cause of disease is inherent in the volcanic soil of the Maremmas, and independent of the abandonment of crops; the observation of the human species in all places, sufficiently demonstrates to us that the spirit of industry first braves the insalubrity of the air, but then triumphs. And that if traveling workers have been arriving to carry out the work in the fields, every so often in season, and under the most formidable circumstances, it should be easier to find men who would come to live in these same places with all the benefits of a wholesome establishment there, if they were sure that their courage would be rewarded.

If there is nothing in the bad air that would prevent the settlement of a rural population, and its growth, in the Roman Campagna. There is even less in the shape of the terrain and its exposure to obstacles to a varied agriculture; which, in other parts of Italy, multiplies the resources of farmers with the products of the soil. By far the greatest

43

part of the Agro Romano seems to have been raised by underground fires. All the layers of rock that we see at the exposed surface seem tormented, forming craggy shapes and letting us glimpse caves everywhere. Hills follow upon hills, and their slope, in what is yet called the plain, however, is often fairly steep; so that a traveler has to harness oxen to his cart. The vine and the olive tree would succeed admirably on these hillsides, and their varied aspects even promise distinguished wines. It is true that a vast plain extends from below the Albano mountains to the Pontine Marshes; this area would perhaps never be entirely sanitized. But the plain of Pisa is no less irrigated by the waters which dominate it; this too is plowed by buffaloes that thrive in the marshes, and yet the grape vine supported on poplars, mulberries, fruit trees, corn, wheat, fodder grasses, offer in the plain of Pisa, and under the regime of arable farming, a succession of uninterrupted harvests.

But a few of the Roman aristocracy and grand-estate holders, its 'Mercanti di campagna' may well answer impatiently: "Our lands are well leased, to entrepreneurs who are not only solvent, but richer than us; they regularly pay us a high annuity; we are content: what more would we want?" And further: "We have brought immense capital and extensive knowledge; we make considerable profits there; we are happy – why is the government minding our affairs? Why would it want to teach us what we should do with our property? Shouldn't it take it for granted that we know our own interests better than it does?" A strong argument, no doubt, but only from a certain perspective. For it is not their interests that the government should

mind, it is the national interests; and it is its sacred duty, not to allow the nation to be wiped out if, by increasing the revenue of whomever it is, this would be the result. And the nation, we say, is indeed affected in all its parts by this system of market agriculture.

44

The comparison of plowing with pasture has clearly shown that the first most often causes a loss to the 'mercante di campagna', and that the second brings them a considerable profit. But it was also shown that the gross proceeds of one thousand two hundred rubbi of grazing land only amount to about 8,000 ecus, and that one-twelfth of these lands subject to plowing would give precisely the same results. It was furthermore shown that a thousand ecus pays the wages in these one thousand two hundred rubbi, while it would take 48,000 ecus to pay them in the same expanse of land subject to plowing, and instead of twenty-four employed by pasture, it would take one thousand one hundred and fifty-two wage earners. In holding on therefore to these vulgar signs of prosperity, the value of products compared to the number of inhabitants making a living from them, the grazing system is infinitely inferior to that of plowing. It is in another way, however, that we now can appreciate the desolation caused by this operating system centering on Rome; whose owners and farmers may very well be equally happy. But it is to them that we attribute the hopeless misery under which the city of Rome itself succumbs, as well as most provincial towns. In Rome, in fact, at the assigned cooperative workshops for artists, hotel owners, coach rental companies, merchants of shops intended only for tourists, everything is languishing, withering, all work has ceased, any industry, other than begging, is prohibited to the poor. Nothing is so common as to hear people accuse Romans of being lazy; to hear them indignantly ask why all these able-bodied men, feebly hanging out on street corners, are not working. They do not want to admit that, in the current organization of society, work is disallowed to the man whom no one calls. Before the eyes of the Romans lies endless Campagna, which remains fallow; its soil is of admirable fertility, but, is it permissible for the poor, who are dying of hunger nearby, to plant only a lettuce? Will these same poor men become masons, carpenters, a hoof smith? All these professions are meant to serve the farmers who feed them in turn; and,

45

within a twenty-five mile radius around Rome, there aren't any farmers. The professions which take part in building houses, must all be abandoned where there are no dwellings, and the unfortunate herders who wander in this countryside sleep in the open air or in natural caves. Elsewhere, the peasants undoubtedly strive to spend not much either on furnishings and their clothing; however they have in their homes, beds, chairs, tables, cupboards, vases of copper and common earthenware, all the utensils of their table and their kitchen, their linen and their clothes, whether festive or working, their footwear, all their equipment and tools

needed on their farms.. For each of these needs of the rural man, a city dweller exists; each piece of furniture represents a trade, an industry. But when a population of the countryside is denied existing, at the same time the entire population of the towns, which was to serve it, is condemned to to live in laziness; forbidding them all trades which feed on the majority of businesses, the commerce between the city and the countryside. All the necessary means for operating a sheepfold of two thousand five hundred sheep, which occupies twelve thousand squares of land, cost, as we have seen, only 30 ecus: how would such agriculture feed industrialists in the cities?

But if the professions do not find work, why, it may be said, do the poor not enter into the factories? This question indicates that whoever asks it does not have a clear idea of what a manufacture is.

One should see in it nothing more than the enterprise of a rich capitalist who, by the advance of considerable funds and expensive machines, puts himself in a position to replace at a competitive price the products of the professions and trades. Whenever these products are not in demand, where, in the absence of consumers, they would be useless, the factory would also be useless. Roman women of the countryside, if there would be any, consume neither sheepskins nor woolen fabrics, nor hardware, nor pottery: what would be the use of establishing factories in Rome that would work on wool, cotton, hemp,

46

leathers, metals, clays? Roman capitalists recognized that manufactures would be poorly placed in Rome, that they would work at a loss. Even if they were mistaken, it suffices that they have not established any; and so the poor cannot go and ask them for work. How many people believe to have answered the complaints of the poor by saying: why don't they just do something? or, that he do something else; while in fact, everything is impossible for him.

However the population of the city of Rome is yet constantly increasing; we are assured that it amounts to one hundred and eighty thousand souls. The number of wealthy foreigners who flock there has been increasing in the last twenty years as well, and there were consequently more means to feed the indigent population with the crumbs which fall from their table. But, on the other hand, the old Roman houses, the princely homes, are for the most part in a more constrained state than they were formerly; and, while there are a couple or three which each year increase their colossal fortune, we see the others successively selling to them their palaces, their gardens and their heritage. At the same time, all the rest of the people are more dependent and more miserable than ever before. But, as we have had occasion to observe a few times, though rarely encountered, destitution needs to be reaching an excess, before it will arrest population growth. Ordinarily, on the contrary, poverty increases it; for it is the fathers, who have lost faith in the future and less foresight, that marry ever younger and have the most children. When in Rome the population increases, we only see an increase in the number of those who ask for work and find none;

who beg for bread and who must live on the charity of individuals, that of the Church or that of the State.

Poverty was not severe enough either to destroy the population of the countryside, it was necessary to expel it to make it disappear. The families of the settlers, expelled from the land they cultivated, and forced to give way to the shepherds, continued to live in villages or small towns where they had their miserable dwellings. Although deprived of their

47

usual livelihood, they did not leave the roof of their fathers' houses under which they were still under cover; flattering themselves that they could keep up by working for the day, doing something, as people keep urging them to do. On the other hand, the landowners who had taken over the ground on which they had to live, did not see them without worry settled on their domain; they felt that their lambs were unlikely to grow up with people starving and unemployed. So they eagerly bought up the cottages that were for sale at a price higher than their value, in order to demolish them. In this way, many old communities have disappeared entirely, and their site is now one of the big domains that once surrounded them. Other small towns, such as Népi or Città-Castellana, received these displaced people, and both their population and their misery increased; because, surrounded as they are by the great-estate owners, they cannot use their hands to work.

A constitution of Pope Pius VII, dated September 18, 1802, clearly and forcefully exposes the conduct of the Roman owners. It is for the pontiff himself to attach the blame where it can be deserved. Pius VII, who had just lost the legations, felt the need to settle a more numerous population in the provinces which had remained faithful to the Church; and the constitution, of which we insert here the preamble, was intended to remind them of it.

“We are,” he said, “all the more determined to resort to the measures as set out below, of which we are deeply convinced that if we do not remedy it, the depopulation and the abandonment of the neighboring countryside of Rome would always be growing. A disastrous experience only too strongly confirms this persuasion. We see, especially in the Campagna, a number of inheritances reduced to the condition of ‘tenute’, that is to say completely depopulated, and abandoned to the natural production of grass, that, only a short time ago, were rich in produce and inhabitants, which is quite clearly established by the rights

48

of justice which are still attached to it. The introduced population had been continuing in these areas, because their owners had wisely encouraged a large number of them to be cultivators, who in return gave them a portion of the fruits of the earth. But a disastrous progress of luxury has gradually caused this method to be abandoned. The owners, seduced by the softness and pleasures of the city, have given up giving culture the assistance they

owe it; the obstacles, that the laws put to the sale and the internal transport of foodstuffs, and the forced prices, may also have contributed to the withering away of culture. These causes, and many others, have engaged the great-estate owners to abandon the laudable custom of dividing their lands among a large number of small settlers. On the contrary they have brought together, only a few very rich farmers who can assure them these regular payments at maturity; by means of which they have abandoned all care of the land to their affairs, and they conveniently spend their lives in luxury and idleness. These farmers in turn, as was to be expected, having only short-term subleases, sought to get rid of all the details of collecting small land rents and sharing small harvests. Far from favoring their small tenants and welcoming new ones, they preferred the grazing industry. They often mistreated the settlers on their farms, or at least they hastened their ruin by not helping them, by not supporting them in bad years or in their illnesses, as is practiced wherever the true culture of the earth is well known and valued. By acting in this way, farmers cut their expenses, and because of labor having become ever more expensive, their method was confirmed as right to them.

As they have driven the settlers away, and they no longer have them employed, the number of men has diminished everywhere around them, and their work has increased in price. But while this method has been very beneficial to them for

reducing their expenses, it was most fatal to the State, by depriving it of its true wealth, of the products of her agriculture and of its people” (1).

Pius VII's plan was as wise as the principles, which he relied on, were honorable. He was not thinking to bring in settlers from outside to build villages, to expose a whole population to the chances of a new business, but to benefit from all the centers of population already existing, to spread around them the small culture, to plant vines and olive trees next to those who are already existing; count on the benefit of example, and entrust the cultivation of these suburban smallholdings to peasants who aren't quite ready yet abandon the city's residence. He judged that the townspeople could very well extend care of the culture up to a mile away from the inhabited areas, and he consequently ordered to redraw a cadaster again from the uncultivated possessions that stretched around Rome and every other city in the state, within a radius of one mile from present cultures. If this initial zone had been, according to his intentions, fenced, planted, and cultivated, he thought that the cultivators would not delay in cleaning it up, that they would then move their homes there; and that from these new homes they would leave to clear the land for a second area also one mile wide; that at the same time, one could also choose to go beyond that, in elevated places, near the purest waters, new centers of culture, to which the government would hasten to attach both a priest and a doctor, and that the improvements would thus extend, step by step, until the circles formed around each city would meet.

But the means chosen by the pontiff to carry out his ambitious projects were not energetic enough. He submitted to tax 5 'paules' per rubbi, the land that their owners would leave uncultivated in the nearest area

(1) 'Motu proprio de Pius VII', by: Nicolai, vol. II, p. 163-185. Editorial staff led by Cardinal Joseph Doria Pamfili, Procamerlengo.

50

to cities; on the contrary, he granted a reduction of 5 paules on their tax, to those who would be cultivated in execution of his edict. The profit was not considerable enough to engage owners or farmers to change their system. Instead of following the intentions of the Pope, they only thought about raising complaints, or obtaining personal exemptions. In the meantime, new revolutions occurred, the State of Rome became reunited with the Empire, the 'Motu Proprio' was forgotten; the rural population continued to be expelled from the fields, and now absolutely nothing remains of the vain attempt of Pius VII. This isn't the result of a violent prejudice among the Romans against the philanthropic measures, but a dull, opinionated opposition from Roman owners to any improvement project.

We do not believe to have gone into too many details with this insight into the history of rural properties around Rome, because we are convinced that a universal trend in Europe threatens us with the same calamities, even in places that today still seem to follow quite a contrary system. Only the Romans went in all the way, while others are barely entering it. This trend is one of centralization. Men today, more than ever, are admirers of strength, of power, of order; they believe to see these attributes attached to a single and intelligent will running everything. The independence of the small nations was the first to be sacrificed to this desire for greatness; it succumbed to political centralization. All the rights of provinces were sacrificed in the same way to legislative centralization; all municipal rights to administrative centralization; all independent armed bodies and all local militias, to military centralization. And today the very same principle dominates in political economy; here too, it is endeavored to subject all of industry to a single, enlightened will, made powerful by immense capital; and all the manual input serving it is wanted to act with a single impulse, without the heads of the multitude getting involved.

The erection of great factories is nothing else than the

51

centralization of industry, or the abolition of trades for the benefit of the factories and their owners. The centralization of trade has been taking place through the accumulation of immense capital, rendered even more available by credit; it tends to get rid of all the lesser provincial merchants, all the shopkeepers, and it is supported by all the improvements made in transportation: by canals, steamships, locomotives and railways; each of them facilitating the achievement of a goal, and this goal is to realize a single super-merchandise billionaire, in direct contact with the most

distant consumers, while annihilating all intermediaries. The system of large farms, finally, is the application of centralization to agriculture; it removes all the small cultivators, to make way for a great manager of ruinous works. As the inspection of such carried out works extends over a larger territory, the system puts ever more enormous capital at its disposal; it also promises all the assistance of science; and, putting faith in superior intelligence, rendering thousands of arms, who are no longer asked to be led by their owners' reasoning, nor to be animated by moral feelings. But the goal of human society must be the progress of men, not that of things. While it is true that centralization perfects everything in things; on the other hand, it destroys everything in men. On the ruins of Rome, how can one not think of the centralization of the Roman Empire? Is there any country in the world that could present in a brighter light: both its wonders and its disastrous effects? There is only one will, one human will, having been directing the strengths and industry of thousands, millions of men; and this intent gathered wealth from the Euphrates to the Caledonian wall, and from Mount Atlas to the Baltic Sea. Man was put at the service of this will and dominated nature; to the orders of this power rose the monuments which cover the earth in all directions. We admire the grandeur, the power that created the Colosseum or the Baths of Caracalla; the immensity of these ruins may seem to us to attest to the triumph of man over nature; but it was

52

more so the triumph of man over man. The whim or the pomp which imposed such works degraded humanity, depopulated Italy, and hastened much more so than the invasions of the barbarians, the ruin of the Roman empire.

Modern centralization, which incorporated all the small sovereignties in great kingdoms of the middle ages, undoubtedly shone the power of the human spirit in their capitals; but it removed from the provinces all that bore the character of intelligence, vigor, greatness and patriotism. An instinct warns us of this sacrifice of individuality to abstract grandeur, and this instinct makes one look lovingly towards the memories of the Middle Ages, which represent to one the senates governing the free cities with their patriotism; as well as to the castles of barons with their proud display of independence. Legislative centralization has made codes of law more uniform, and perhaps more perfect; but it has deprived the provinces of their character, their nationality, and the careers of developing talent and distinction in provincial parliaments and states.

French administrative centralization established an admirable and uniform order in the finances of forty thousand municipalities; but it also closed the schools where men could learn the application of the social sciences, and get used to the idea counting oneself as secondary after the public interest. Military centralization put an end to all rivalry between individuals, and destroyed any idea of independence in their commanders; it simplified the maintenance of discipline, according a single desire to create an army and militia befitting a great empire. And while in France national bravery has

not been weakened by this centralization; we no longer ask the militias for this ardent patriotism, which would have made them do wonders around walls of their cities, when these cities were theirs. Industrial centralization, in towns and in the countryside, does not sacrifice men for things any less either, so as to letting individuals suffer, to benefit some abstract idea. It did advance science as applied to all industrial arts, but it has also made it

53

foreign to the greatest number of those who practice those industries. It has accumulated capital, but centralization has reduced the number of rich; it has multiplied the products of which wealth is composed and brought them into existence at a lower cost, but it has also re-allocated revenues to those who can buy them; and finally, while creating the wonders of the industrial arts, alongside of them, it has also created the scourges of proletarians and pauperism.

Indeed, the centralization of industry, either in the city or in the growing fields, has as its first effect, one could even say it to be its pursued goal: producing at a minimum of production costs; to have done more things with less expenditures. Centralization offers more to sell while at the same time offering less in wages and thus a gainability to those who make all purchasable things, but who at the same time also form the great mass of consumers.

It therefore has the concomitant effect of cluttering up retail markets, of cluttering up, if not that of the industry which works at lower price than their competitors, at least that of the economy as a whole. So the capitalist, by a necessary consequence of centralization, proposes first of all to save on the costs of production, consequently to decrease the number of men who previously contributed to its work, and finally to decrease the mass of consumption goods that were previously obtainable on the market. The Roman aristocrat, the owner of these immense heritages each of which corresponds to a powerful republic in the middle ages, going back all the way to antiquity, has traveled this progression. He first sought to save on cultivation costs, to retain a bigger part in the products of the soil, so as to leave a smaller portion to the settlers; whom he then gradually expelled because he looked at them as expenses; he then finally attached himself to the concept of exploitation which, on a given extent of land, can be shown to produce less raw output; and thus substituting it by grazing, as finding it to be the one that left him with the most net product. We saw this manner of thinking applied in Ireland, and similarly identified it as happening in Scotland 'the clearing of an estate'; and warned that, by the same means, not only are we advancing towards the same goal, but so are the English and all without recognizing it. In other countries, where great culture still prevails, many owners, excited by the advice of society's

54

learned, devoted themselves to a redirection of agricultural work; they took the control of farms back into their own hands, they introduced

mechanized plows and other sophisticated tools that save on man power; by combining several farms into one, they saved on incidental expenses, they did more with less labor; but, at the same time, when they made up their final accounts, they discovered to their astonishment that they were losing. They had brought to agriculture a management, that took it for granted that the high cost of labor was ruining them; and so applied rural science, having made so much progress in their hands, should have thus bettered their situation. In France, the result of these calculations was to lead many of the large landowners to sell their land by plots to peasants that political circumstances had made it possible to buy them. In other countries, the nobility was unwillingly undone of its hereditary patrimony; it has little faith in public funds, and does not entrust their fortune to them; on the other hand, the peasants are less eager to buy; therefore the big owners seek to regain their revenue by ever greater savings on human labor, and by more ingenious methods of increasing their production and reducing their consumption. They don't realize that they are walking the same path where Roman princes have marched, and are consequently hit by the same consequences; they run, but the terminus is before them – and this terminus is Rome and the Roman Campagna.

In France, we believe, the general trend today is towards plot sales and plot leases, saving society from a great danger; but one submits to it, as to an unavoidable calamity of the present time, rather than it were a great remedy. Gibes, sometimes curses, pursue the speculators of the 'bande noire' who facilitate these divisions of property; and the sellers themselves exhale in poetic regrets about the division of these beautiful heritages, which seemed to them one of the glories of the country. In rural societies, the academe does not seem to have any other progress than that of great culture at heart; capitalists companies are formed to establish this same system in the colonies, in Algiers, the Cape of Good Hope, Swan River.

In north-eastern Europe, in the countries of serfdom, emancipation, instead of associating the serfs with property, has detached them from the soil; throughout Italy one can recognize the tendency of owners to substitute large field cultivation for the small. In Tuscany, there are the 'Chianes' large farms of the Maremmas, which attract public attention. We have noted the trends of agriculture in England, how all the other contracts of working the land had disappeared before that of tenancy, and how at each lease renewal the farms were getting bigger, because every day it became more impossible for the small farmers to compete with the big guys. So we feel like braving a torrent of new opinions and doctrines; however, we will not be discouraged. The sight of the Roman Campagna makes the abyss which we are drawn towards better known. At least there, by now everyone recognizes that the system of large farms has been pushed too far; there the authority, the enlightened people, the commoners, all agree that the human-labor economy has been producing a terrible calamity. So let's find out what it is that could be done for the Campagna of Rome, and if we succeed in showing how the rural population could be renewed

where it had disappeared, we will perhaps get a better feel for the danger and the crime of destroying it where it still exists.

56

ELEVENTH ESSAY

How to Resettle the Population and Culture in the Roman Campagna.

We believe it to be an important part of political economy, and perhaps the most important part of all: to consider the question of the fate of the inhabitants of the countryside. Indeed, it seemed to us that, in any well established society, these people have always formed by far the most numerous part of the nation; and we know that all in all, regardless of the seemingly more prevalent activities in urban manufacturing and its related commerce, these same countryside inhabitants produce a mass of value that is many times more considerable. We also know that in the allocation of human work, no occupation is conducive to as much happiness, and that on the other hand, none can be reduced to such a degree of misery while yet continuing to exist. Each of these considerations should have been recognized, on the part of economists, and given much more attention than it has got as of this day.

It is not in any way abstractive, it hasn't been according to the principles of material wealth formation that we have wanted to convey an account of the condition of the cultivators. On the contrary, we have sought to clarify their existence in various countries, and which various relationships they maintained with the other classes of society. This study did indeed make our hearts stir with emotion on several occasions.

57

We have pointed out parts of Europe, countries richly endowed by nature, enjoying fertile soil and a pleasant climate; where, however, a large and starving population works beyond their strength to earn a puny bit of food and insufficient wages. We noted others where the moral character of the peasant has been degraded by poverty, where he has become too used to preferring the offerings of charity to labor wage, and where his rags signal his laziness more so than his poverty. Outside of Europe, but under the domination of European masters, the whip and chains were represented as necessary to force the peasant to work; no reward is promised to him, no hope animates him, no labor for him is voluntary; and finally we will come to see, how around Rome, the vices regarding the organization of social welfare prevailed over the beneficence of nature, and the lifeblood of the human species, and how the entire class of peasants was wiped out. But in the very places which present such sad examples, it suffices to go

back at other times, to find the depiction of another social organization to acquire the proof that among all the occupations offered to men, none have been blessed by Providence with richer promises than that of cultivators. The work of the fields brings forth the greatest reward of all; its promises are filled with abundance, health, peace of heart, and benevolence; it will nourish one's soul and intelligence as well as one's body; it finally ensures the happiness of societies, all provided that no other man stands between the farmer and the earth; so that the former does not claim to collect where he has not sown, and demand pay, and pay with usury, where he has not worked, or for services he has not rendered. The fertility of the ground that is cultivated by agriculture is one of the greatest blessings that Divinity has bestowed upon the human species; despite often having been abused by some in order to submit others to the most frightful tyranny imaginable. The comparison between so much suffering and the memory of so much bliss awakens both the heart and the intelligence;

58

it is impossible not to ask oneself: what is needed to remedy the present ailments, to find the prosperity of the past? It is impossible not to arrogate momentarily all the rights of the legislator, not to propose projects of real reform, not to formulate them, such as if we ourselves have thought of carrying them out. We are keenly aware however, of the appearance of presumptiveness and extreme arrogance in offering advice which hasn't been asked for; to blame the conduct of the leaders of nations, to tell them what they should have done in situations where those more skillful than us have failed. If such council has any bad grace at all, it can easily become ridiculous, and we also feel that it puts the critic in a situation that is most disadvantageous; for he needs to renounce the role of spectator and judge, and to become an actor and be judged in turn.

Any reform project is open to many detailed objections; so one in fact sets oneself up as an easy target to triumph over, for anyone who is aware of a local circumstance, anyone who brings out an unanticipated difficulty that is unknown to the author and thus ignored.

The defender of order or rather of current abuses, tells us, he is armed with on-the-ground facts and practical knowledge, and he almost always finds the public inclined to believe that he who sighs for better times is a simply a dreamer who does not know the world.

The one who will depict with truth and with talent, the horrors of slavery in the West Indies, the despair of the Highlanders driven from their homes, the destitute misery of the Irish, or the desert and desolation of the Roman Campagna, might well leave a profound impression on his readers; he may move their souls, and could obtain all the literary success to which he aspires to; but this won't draw a tear, won't halt abuse, will not introduce a single change in an established dangerous system; of this we are entirely convinced. The hope of serving humanity, in making happiness follow up on suffering can only be maintained by one who, beside what is, shows what should be. Charitable views in general will always be applauded, but they will not descend from

speculative regions, they will not be judged as capable of application before they have taken the form of projects. Only then will they relate to defined places, to specially appointed men, under circumstances that will have been made known with precision. We believe real political economy is that which is always ready to pass from rules to applications, which is not content to show absolute evil or absolute good, and abstract rules, and systematic progress of population or wealth; but which, on the contrary, takes into account all the difficulties that a given circumstance presents, of all existing interests, of all the dominant prejudices, and that nevertheless subjects them all to the great fundamental law of society, to the pursuit of the greater good of the human race.

In the previous Essay, we sought to make one familiar with the current state of desolation in the Roman Campagna, and to show by what causes, by what successive revolutions this same country, which had once been covered with a population as prosperous as it was numerous, underwent its entire disappearance. It is also, in a special way, to the means that could be employed to restore the culture there and bring the population back to the Rome, which we will tie into the existing is one. We must say however, whatever attention we have brought to bear on all local circumstances, whatever care we have taken to clarify the successive steps that we think could be taken, we have no presumption of giving advice to a government that most certainly did not ask for it; we only believe we can present to authority a few more elements for it to consider; at the same time we believe that we are addressing the supporters of science in all countries, and invite them to consider that the only empirical lesson the social sciences can draw from is the study of established facts, and a deduction from those leading – to be hoped for results in circumstances which are entirely determined and which do not depend on the observer; we finally have in sight other parts of the globe where the need to renew the population

dedicated to agriculture is no less felt, and for the progress of which a detailed example is far more important than a theoretical approach. Indeed, the Roman Campagna of is not the only country where deserts have replaced an ancient civilization. It is only the abundant but unusable vegetation of these deserted fields that makes such a profound impression, because of them extending to the walls of the ancient capital of the world, and that twenty thousand foreign travelers intent on observing a novel environment cross them every year. But the province that the Greek emperors continued to own in Italy, after the fall of the Latin Empire, the ‘Tavoliere di Puglia’, presents, over a length of one hundred and fifty miles, and a breadth of sixty to seventy, a desolation that is at least equal to the Roman Campagna, and must be attributed to the same causes. Most of Greece and Romania, to the gates of Constantinople, from Asia Minor,

Syria, the countries of northern Africa, and more than half of Spain and Portugal, are similarly abandoned to an empty pasture.

We hardly pay any attention to it, because despotism, the uncertainty of all property, fanaticism, barbarism, seem most often sufficient to explain the destruction of the human species, in a countryside that was once so fertile. However, alongside all of them, there are also others that have preserved their ancient culture, under governments which were no better, and whose protection was as uncertain as it was capricious. By looking more closely one recognizes in these various countries, as in Rome, the correctness of Pliny's expression: 'Latifundia perdidere Italiam, imo et provincias'. Also the search for means to restore to the earth its fertility and its inhabitants, and to the human race its prosperity and its hopes, can become profitable, not only to the Roman Campagna, but to all those other countries whose 'Latifundia', the disproportionate heritages, caused desolation. Among these countries, and we can mention several, it is true, where one cannot hope for the beneficent and intelligent action of its government; there are some where one is tempted to

61

rejoice that one does not encounter more inhabitants, because the mass of human misery is thereby reduced also. Human beings being able to live there only under the condition of oppression and having to suffer. But yet, there are other countries where a firm desire to do good, or, if you will, to enrich those who in turn will enrich the class above them, isn't lacking; and where perhaps the very absence of any legal guarantees for ancient properties, would facilitate the work of the legislator, if it succeeded in knowing the goal to which it must aim. It is therefore a general question that we are dealing with when talking about the Roman Campagna; where we set out to indicate the cause which, in various places, has extended its disastrous influence; we are thus looking for the principle reaction which, applied wherever this cause is seemingly apparent, would spread the same benefits everywhere.

But on the other hand we also believe that in order to be effective in doing good to one's fellow human beings, one must limit one's philanthropy; one must not set out to calculate in an abstract way how many men can live happily on a given amount of land, and project them from there to all parts of the known world. One must think of the Romans in Rome, the Greeks in Greece, to Africans in Africa, everywhere to those whom nature or Providence has already placed on the ground, and who have received the Divine mission to multiply and improve therein, and not give in to those who, attracted by the encouragement of power, will import a new industry and new products for world commerce. The obscure principles of social art themselves are still too much wrapped up and under cover. The good that man can and wants to do is too often found to be mixed up with an unknown malevolency. It is all too human when something appears wise, to take charge voluntarily of a great responsibility, to take upon oneself the office of Providence, and to mold to one's liking the whole destiny of a race that does not yet exist. Each of us, as a member of society, is called to

contribute to the best of our effort, with all its available impulses, to the improvement of what exists; whatever causes of misery, suffering, of oppression are encountered along the way, it is felt as a duty to remove them; to render society more united, with easier

62

paths for all to travel, that each, with his intelligence and his individual activities, traces for himself towards happiness. But we never should be forgetting people for abstractions; we must never allow ourselves to pass judgment on a race as imperfect, and to regard it as a progress of society when that race is removed from influence or at least suppressed; and its replacement by another is contemplated, from which more intelligence, activity, and educational susceptibility, is assumed.

This rule of conduct is based on humanity and on a well-founded mistrust of ourselves; and unfortunately, it has absolutely been lost sight of by the founders of modern colonies. While the ancients civilized the natives as a matter of course, the modern colonists exterminate them to replace them by whites. This question is too serious for it not to be dealt with it here in these Essays; it fits, to a certain point, in the segmentation of our studies on territorial wealth, since colonization is one of the most effective means to return to the land inhabitants it has lost. or that it can feed.

We will devote the following Essay to it. In this one we will be applying the same rule but on a smaller scale. Those who are thinking of returning its former population to the Roman state, or who are intending to restore cultivation in the provinces of Spain, do not take as the cornerstone of their calculation the spoliation of the natives, as we have scrupulously done in the colonies of America, Australasia, Cape of Good Hope, and today once again in Algeria. But it is for this reason, that they are thinking of importing into the countries' deserts a new population. They claim, among other things, that it is impossible to expect any work from the Romans; that these indolent and degraded people do not want to lend themselves to fatigue; that they only know how to live in the idleness of entryways or in the street; that there are no other occupations for them than portering or begging; and that the first step to return the Roman Campagna to cultivation is to repopulate it with inhabitants from those countries where man loves work, and where rural science is understood.

63

We don't of course reject the real advantages that an infusion of foreign customs and habits can have; the ever growing activity of commerce has made this it much easier in our century than in any that preceded it. We agree that teaching by example is the most powerful of all teachings, that it is the only one that acts effectively on unlearned minds, the only one also by means of which one can introduce novel manual operations; as the men who only have theoretical knowledge won't be able to convey that knowledge well to men who only have muscular strength.

So it will often be with joy that we see a backward country receiving these useful agricultural teachers, be they sharecroppers, farmhands, or even day laborers, who bring it the practices of a more advanced country. But we should not for a moment lose sight of the original inhabitants of a country, and the advantage their progress will mean. In law, we believe that it is to them that Providence has given the land they inhabit, and that the law guarantees possession to the owners only for the benefit of society, and that these owners cannot ever turn their privilege against the society from which they hold that guarantee. In fact, we believe that all human races are perfectible, that all are equally capable of accomplishing the task that Providence has prepared for them, and that if some have not been able to enter the course of civilization, it is only the fault of their teachers, or the institutions that were imparted on them.

By stopping at the country which is the subject of this Essay, where the question is what should be done to repopulate the State of Rome by the Romans, to re-enhance the value of its countryside by means of Roman capitals. The involvement of a few foreigners in this, the use of some foreign capital to achieve this goal, will probably be found advantageous; but we would consider, on the contrary, it to be a calamity and an injustice if any enterprise on a large scale, would be handing over the benefits of this restoration to foreign capitalist speculators, or to cultivators other than Romans.

64

Starting from this principle, it is not necessary to seek the bases of a new method to follow; there is no other one possible, than the one adopted by Pope Pius VII: we must take advantage of all the population centers that are already existing, each of them must spurn activity all around it, and successively extend such action over concentric circles, by which it will push ever further while increasing in strength, until all these circles meet, and they comprise the entire barrens. It's like throwing a stone in calm water, we see a first circle form around the point where each stone hit the water; it extends, and a second and a third follow, the movements keep propagating until the circles of the various centers meet, and the ripple has spread over the entire the surface of the water.

But, in order to apply this principle, it is important to know in some detail the various centers of activity which already exist in the Roman state, the resources they can offer for cultivation, and the influence they did exert in the old days. Our observations are still far from being capable to form a satisfactory whole; we will however present them here as an example, and as an indication of what remains to be done.

We have repeatedly referred to by the names of 'Agro Romano', and the 'Roman Campagna', all this vast expanse of a barren landscape, in four provinces in the center of which Rome is located, as representing the same aspect of desolation. We must caution however that this designation isn't entirely accurate, as the name of Campagna should only be given to the plain which extends from the left of the Tiber to the Marais-Pontins; while the name of 'Agro Romano' is properly given to a territory surrounding

Rome which stretches all around the city, within a radius from about ten to twenty miles, or to the places where it meets up with the territory of the other cities of the State. The project of Pope Pius VII was to let each city improve its proper territory, to the Romans that of Rome, to the inhabitants of Velletri, Tivoli, Viterbo and Civita Vecchia, the territory that surrounded their own community.

65

The proper territory of Rome or the Agro Romano contains 111,106 rubbi [555.530 acres] of land. Of this area only 910 rubbi [4550 acres] are fully enclosed and cultivated with vines, olive trees and 'canneti', or plantations of reeds intended to support the vines; these enclosures are located around Rome and the castles and cities of Ostia, Albano, Genzano, etc.

Everything else is deserted and shared between 362 owners; but among these, there are 42 having less than 200 rubbi, 289 have 200 to 1000, 31 have more than 1000.

The number of farmers or 'mercanti di tenute' is even less than that of the landowners. In the list formed in 1803 we found 145 entered, but as we had included many barons who owned estates there (the princes Barberini, Borghesi, Cesarini, for example), the number of real farmers did not reach eighty, and it is even less today (1).

These are the nine hundred and ten rubbi of enclosed and cultivated land that contain the only rural population of Agro Romano, and which alone present an example of what all the rest can become too. Around Rome the 'villas', or country homes of the nobility, with their enormous gardens, by themselves take up such a large area that very little space would be left for cultivation. These 'villas', which one after the other are bought up by the Prince Borghese, the Duke and Banker Torlonia, or some other one of the Roman millionaires, therefore cease to be inhabited by anyone other than the concierge, who shows them to foreigners, but who no longer gives the gardens the necessary attention so that they do not cover themselves with brush. This work, done sparingly by gardeners or laborers for wages, costs much more than any revenue from the property. And a fresh-water supply brought in at great expense by those who built these princely residences, sometimes languish through the negligence of absent owners; a thick grass stretches under the maritime pines, or on vast esplanades, and it is covered by a heavy dew; the land is not plowed, and the air

(1) Ibid., Nicolai, vol. II, p. 207, 223, 231, 237, etc.

66

around all these celebrated 'villas' is almost always as unhealthy as that in the deserted countryside.

A very small portion of the area, enclosed by fencing, surrounding Rome in the midst of ruins, like gardens formed in the neighboring deserts and therefore easily made note of, is occupied by farmers who took this land on emphyteutic lease to farm. These operations are generally devoted to

horticulture, and the vicinity of an opulent market make this a profitable industry; fruits and vegetables are plentiful in Rome and are reasonably priced; the vegetable gardens appear fertile, but they do not present an image of order and cleanliness that we noticed in more industrially developed countries.

This abandonment of luxurious country homes, this neglect in vegetable-garden cultivation, cannot help but give the traveler the impression of a universal nonchalance, of the incapacity of Romans to do agricultural work. This impression will be further strengthened when the traveler stops at one of those numerous groups of workers that the pontifical government has been hiring in charitable make-work projects, like 'Campo Vaccino', for example. Every day we see hundreds of men, with a small hoe in hand, or pushing a small wheelbarrow, busily upsetting a little mud. Six-year-olds wouldn't shirk away from the load to which they are limited; the slowness of their movements is almost laughable, each stroke of the hoe does not take away more than a pinch of earth; after each fourth or fifth they stop, they talk, they rest. It looks like we commissioned to make a caricature out of mercenary labor, showing everyone that a man who has been deprived of his freedom, or who himself alienated from it for a time, has no more left than a single interest in the world, that of avoiding any fatigue; he will do no more than the work necessary to not be chastised. These are indeed the disastrous consequences of mercenary work done without any desire to succeed, which is ruining the Roman state, the total indifference of the henchmen who are watching over the Campo Vaccino workers, allows the vices of such projects to become more exposed, but the spirit is the same everywhere.

67

Mercenary workers who work for the 'mercante di tenuta' must conceal their laziness a little better, avoid a little more carefully the eye of the overseer, who however just like them is hired. From these practices arose the use of carrying out just about all work in the Roman Campagna on a contract basis: while a worker then will bring all his diligence to complete his task, but he does not use his intelligence to succeed: it doesn't matter to him if the work he does is of no value, all that matters instead is its quick completion and pay.

The first glance that lingers on the enclosed and cultivated areas that are surrounding the small towns of the Agro Romano awakens expectations. There we see at the same time what an abundance of fruits can cover the earth in those regions, and of what diligent industry its inhabitants are capable. There is no transition from the desert to the most cultivated areas. You're coming almost to the gate of small towns, through these pastures as far as the eye can see, these fallows, or these forests, where nature displays all the luxury of a stunning fertility, but where man seems to have decided to put only a bare minimum of it to good use.

All of a sudden a wall or a simple hedge appears, and beyond which one finds the most industrious culture possible made with nothing but a spade,

orchards tended as would be the gardens, vines low, tight, and supported on reeds assembled with so much craft that each vine has all the influences of free-flowing air; olive trees whose vigorous and dark green vegetation announces the rich products that will be coming off, and everywhere one can feel the vigilant eye of the master owner who at the same time is the cultivator; everywhere we recognize how precious, in his estimation, is every foot of this same ground, that so disdainfully lies abandoned just a short distance away.

It has been twenty years since I last saw Ostia, and I will not say anything about the enclosure of vines that the Roman cadaster indicates to be there. But they prove that the worst air does not stop agricultural enterprises, if the abuse of property rights does not get in the way. In the whole Roman state there may not be a single place where the air is as unhealthy as in the city of Ostia. The vast salt marshes, which yet remain on all sides around this city, and almost without having inhabitants,

68

would suffice to poison the atmosphere, if it did not already got its share from all the dreaded influences of the air of the Maremmes.

But the most industrious of Roman cultures is the one we find from place to place on the slopes of the hills which are grouped around the 'Monte Cavo', the 'Mons Albanus' of the Romans. There, riant little towns arise close together from each other, in most picturesque conditions; and each has its own small enclosure of vines, orchards, and well tended gardens which belong to its citizens. Each one is also home to vast palaces of the Roman princes who come to spend a few months of vacationing there each year, and these palaces are surrounded by magnificent gardens, but about half are abandoned; forests of evergreen trees cover them with their thick shade; the creeks that have been dug there at great expense, to make them spring up in fountains or fall in cascades, overlap in part and losing their independence through the carelessness of the concierges. The gardens, not tall enough for the wind to constantly purify them, are haunted in summer by fever. But finally, much of this group of mountains is the indivisible, inalienable property of some Roman nobleman or a pious foundation; it is therefore doomed to remain barren, although the air is perfectly healthy, it isn't possible to plow and graze the plains there, but on the contrary these rich hillsides seem to be inviting vineyards and olive groves. Thus the site once occupied by Albalonga, the cradle of Rome, is now a thick forest, semi traversable by a sunken path, where one plunges into the mud. The site of the ancient Tusculum, famous in classical times and also still in the middle ages, is covered with underbrush through which we have to search to find the fragments of columns of the ancient city and the remains of its amphitheatres; and in the interior slope of the two craters whose bottom is covered by the two charming lakes of Castel-Gandolfo and Némi; barely the eighth part of it is planted with olive trees and vines, while everything else is covered in evergreen trees, bushes and wild plants that attest to the soil's fertility.

The enclosed lands of Frascati, scattered vast gardens covering the foot of the hills, are among those which display the most care and intelligence. Those of Marino, constricted on the mountain side by magnificent forests, to which cultivators are not allowed access, and on the side of the plain by pastures, also attest despite their small extent to a prominent agricultural industry. The inhabitants of Castel-Gandolfo, surrounded by the papal palace and its vast gardens, or rather the woods of Villa Barberini, have had permission to apply their industry only on the side of the lake, and they have been cultivating the steep slope that separates them from the lake's edges. The charming town of Albano, containing six thousand inhabitants, who, with the exception of perhaps two hundred families, all have some small territorial property; these are restricted to cultivation however to only that part of the hill's slope through which the Romans dug the marvelous 'emissario', and measures barely two square miles. The most unhappy inhabitants of the ancient and picturesque Lariccia, cannot obtain from Prince Chigi, whose heritage surrounds them on all sides, permission to clear either the magnificent woods that crest their hills, or almost any part of the narrow valley where the Nemicus river takes its source. Their misery is extreme and continues to increase. They are only called to do some outdoor clearing work, when a loss in game forces the prince into having to cut down the ancient oaks; which were the ornament of the country and elicited the admiration of painters. The inhabitants of Némi have turned all their industry towards planting vines and olive trees on the portion of the crater slope which has been ceded to them. Those of Genzano and of Lanuvium or Città-Lavigna, have been finding more liberality among the owners. They are Duke Cesarini, Prince Chigi, and Prince Borghese; the latter has the heritage of the Cenci in this district; it was given to his ancestors when the whole Cenci family, even including young children, was put to death, as a sign of execration the crime of the father of the beautiful and unhappy Beatrix, and in revenge for it. Since a long time, all these lands have been granted

in perpetual emphyteutic leases, and they produce the best and most famous wines of the Roman state.

Although the cultivated lands throughout this group of mountains is much less valuable than that of the plains, and that the 'mercanti di campagna' hardly consent to enter then into their lease agreements, at the rate of 3 ecus per rubbi, to make coal; when the princes agreed to cede them in emphyteutic lease to the inhabitants of small towns, they fetch a much higher price, 4, 5 and 6 ecus per rubbi, and around Genzano the annual cannon rises to 10 ecus per rubbi, and the value of bare property for sale is usually 200 ecus. Within Albano, however, several of these leases were granted by religious corporations, for the fee of certain church services. The Pope, pressed for money, has allowed in the last two or three years to

to redeem almost all of them, and the tenants have thus become owners on terms that are almost always advantageous.

The others are also hereditary owners, not of the bare lands themselves, but of the 'miglioramento', or of the improvements that were made to the capital which they successively have been doing. Nearby Genzano, the miglioramento is worth at least 600 ecus per rubbi. This is three times the value of the land; but we must not forget that this fund itself sells for at least four times the price that uncultivated and brush-covered land right next to it goes for. Culture has therefore given the deserted land twelve times the value it had before; a capital, twelve times greater than the entire value of the fund, has been accumulated in a way that we will examine elsewhere, by changing it into vineyards.

The annual costs of cultivation in the district of Genzano are estimated at 100 ecus per rubbi; a family that has the 'miglioramento' of as many rubbi of land as it counts in individuals, is deemed to live in ease; indeed, the rubbi is roughly equivalent to the seven 'jugera' which formed the plot of land sustaining an ancient Roman family; however the

winegrowers claim that their profits are very limited, and hardly make up for the chances of bad harvest years. According to a recent report, this culture has become more expensive for them than it should be. These winegrowers are now all city dwellers; they have become unaccustomed to the hard work in the fields, or they look at it as beneath them to submit to it. Those who hold the pruning knife, and who do all the smaller chores in the vineyard, are generally locals too. But for doing any heavy digging, they call on workers from the Abruzzo, or they have it carried out by the mountain dwellers of the colder regions of Monte Cavo, or the inhabitants of Rocca di Papa, who want to go back to sleep in their own homes every night, although the distance is at least five or six miles. As a result they won't be present early in the morning, and the waste of time and travel fatigue must make their cooperation expensive.

We can see, however, by these examples, that in the Agro Romano itself, when clearing would be allowed by owners, and when these guarantee the hardworking man that he would benefit himself as well as his descendants from the improvements which he would have made to the land, so that they would inherit the fruit of his sweats. Neither the strength of body, nor the constancy, nor the industry, nor the intelligence were lacking in the Roman population to carry the soil to its highest degree of culture. We also see that when these same rich, to get this work done, turned to the poor, it was the poor who found or were able to generate a capital that was ten or twelve times the value of the land they were realizing. This effect is also reminiscent of Adam Smith's observation that taxes on the consumption of the rich are always sterile, and that only those on the consumption of the poor will fill the treasury, if only because the poor are the great number. One can generalize this observation: it is for the poor alone that vigorous cooperation should be requested; and the savings of the poor, although

accumulating by nickle and dimes, are the only ones which can found a national opulence.

Before leaving the subject of small towns, we believe to have to say a word about Tivoli, which is outside the Agro

72

Romano, and which presents us with differences in how the cultivating system operates. The Tivoli mountain is low because the fall of the Anio, which enriches this delightful landscape by the sight of a great waterfall, that powers so many industrial plants, from which we see the flow of water coming out, is less than three hundred feet of elevation. Just a bit above Tivoli, the rock is already bare, and nothing could ever be done to cultivate the slope to produce something. But from below this height to the plain, and to the tomb of Plautius Lucanus, where we find the desert, the slopes of all the mountains are coated, to an extent of fifteen to eighteen miles, with olive trees, the most beautiful, the most vigorous and the most ancient ones that one could encounter in Italy. The farmers assure that us several of them already existed from time of Our Lord; which agrees with our experience of this tree's slow growth. It's impossible to determine by what system of cultivation these plantations could have been carried out in such a remote antiquity; it is probable however, that the greater number is due to emphyteutic leases, which were well known to the Romans. But today, they are almost all the property of the big Lords of Rome, namely the Massimi, Braschi, Torlonia and Borghese, whose possessions are to be found everywhere, and of a few less wealthy others. Few cultivated lands will fetch a higher value; we are in the habit of estimating them by feet of olive tree. Each centenary olive tree is worth 6 to 10 ecus, and since there are at least three hundred and fifty trees in a square rubbi, this rubbi is worth 2 to 3,000, and even 4,000 ecus. As an extension of these same mountains, in those of Umbria, in those that one encounters on the road to Viterbo, one sees the slopes on all sides covered with an abundance of wild vegetation of evergreen trees, which soil would also be peculiar to olive trees.

Several belong to the same owners, and aren't worth 50 ecus, often not even 10 ecus per rubbi. They don't have to ask for the consent of anyone to also convert those slopes to olive tree plantations; but even the richest owners are too poor

73

to do it; the planting of a rubbi of land with olive trees would cost them about 1,000 ecus; during the first six or eight years, it is necessary to continue having expenses for this plantation, although the tree still does not return absolutely anything. It is not before a hundred years has passed that it can be considered as being fully productive. Who is the landowner who can dedicate ten times, twenty times the capital value of his land to improve it? It can only happen by speculation of the poor but industrious working man, this is his real savings bank. He is less impatient to reap the

fruits of his labor, than the rich person who worries about not collecting any interest on his money. In the form of work, he entrusts his least bit of savings to the earth, and that never leads to a bankruptcy: after centuries, it returns again to his children, a hundredfold, what he advanced to mother earth. The savings banks, like many other modern inventions, aren't a new benefit, but only a palliative for new calamities. Where the poor own, or at least are associated with the ownership of the land, or to that of industry, the savings bank only presents a false and dangerous seduction. It diverts him from using his small savings on the land that he can improve by work, so that he can make the soil more profitable; now giving him only one, and insufficient security. But since the poor have been uprooted from the land, since neither the big farm nor a large factory is any longer receiving his small savings, it became a necessity and profitable to the banks to open up another optional placement.

But the Roman barons, who hardly plant olive trees, and who had to wait for the peasants to do this on speculation for them; once they saw them established, no longer wanted to leave the peasants a share in their culture. The great lords feel a kind of jealousy toward the peasantry as being small owners; they seek to round them all up, and successively buy all the small inheritances from the poor. They start by lending money to those who may have either royalty free or emphyteutic leases; having thus acquired a right on their now mortgaged land, they propose to them to cede

ownership by reserving their cultivation for him, because they give them to understand that they will keep them on as sharecroppers. Time however always comes where they renege on that promise to them. In this way all the small farmers were successively excluded from the hills of Tivoli, and the same system prevailed in places where the desolation of the Roman Campagna countryside never happened; in the beautiful Terni Valley, for example. The lords believe that the culture of olives requires little work, that there is deceit in giving up half of its fruit to the sharecropper; so they dismiss the latter, and they set up another account, by hiring workers who come to them from the Ancôna marshes or the Abruzzo, for weeding or plowing that only needs to be done once every two or three years. But in the same way they can hardly entrust the harvest to local mercenary hands; women and children have to go pick olives, despite the winter rains, and far from any inspection; half of the fruit would be stolen if self-interest took the place of supervisors. Therefore the Roman lords handed the work over to the very inhabitants of Tivoli. At the time when the olives begin to ripen, in October they arrive to auction off plots of land, the yield of which having previously been estimated by surveyors. Such parcel of land may have been estimated to return thirty barrels of oil if all works out; a poor family takes the risks, assumes the work, and undertakes to return twenty, twenty-two, or twenty-four barrels to the landowner. The entire poor part of the population therefore approaches the job with all the self-interested ardor and all the intelligence it can muster. Despite the rains and snows, very few olives are lost; but this deal only lasts for a short season, its

conditions vary each year due to a bad harvest, and as the poor compete with each other, the less work will render, and the more they do so at low prices. Besides, those who harvest olives do not take any interest in the fund that sustains them; they degrade it instead of maintaining it, as the trees will be poorly cared for, workers poorly paid, and the population of Tivoli, like that of Terni, is in misery.

75

The same principle of economy, or rather the same greed, has distorted the tenant's contract where it is still practiced. The master descending to the details of culture, wanted to extract the maximum profit off those whom he needed to advance; but his greed deceived him; his part ended up worse than if he had shared everything equally. One reason being that the farmer has lost his independence and his attachment to the ground; thus, for example, at the foot of the hill of Tivoli, in the Villa Adriani, belonging to Duke Braschi, for every four barrels of oil, the master keeps three and gives only one to the sharecropper; all barrels of wine are shared equally; every three bags of durum wheat, beans, or other spring seeds, the farmer keeps two, and give only one to the master; out of every four sacks of common wheat, finally, the peasant keeps three. But the result of these modifications to the original contract is that the peasant is: being watched ceaselessly by the Duke's agent, ceaselessly thwarted, working without ardor, without persistence, without intelligence; and that in the Roman state, it is rare that he retains the same farm for more than two or three years.

According to the census of 1769, the four provinces of Lazio, Sabina, Marittima and Campagna, which are all located beyond the Tiber, counted (in addition to the inhabitants of Rome) one hundred twenty thousand inhabitants, all domiciled in towns, cities, or 'castelli' (villages enclosed by walls), and almost all of them, are called upon to make a living from agriculture. But next to those who have some small possession in the fields, or some secure livelihood in the rural economy, there is a large number of individuals or families who have been pushed away from their occupation, who have lost their little heritage fund in land, who were evicted by their creditors, or driven out by the owners, and who form this large, frightening class of proletarians, the scourge of modern societies. Sometimes they try to take on some city trade, to become blacksmith, masons, carpenters, shoemakers, tailors, shopkeepers, but they do not find enough customers to occupy them and make a

76

living; sometimes they offer their hands to the owners of land, either for the more heavy work of the small inheritances of the hillsides, or for sowing and harvesting the large fields in the plains, but these occasional jobs occupy them only a few weeks in the year: all the rest of the time they are condemned to idleness, and they must live off the product that they can steal from the countryside, or by begging.

We cannot repeat often enough to the rich, that he does, according to the language of Scripture, a work that deceives him; when wants to gain to the detriment of the poor, when he saves on costs forming their subsistence. The Roman nobles had only one thought: to obtain from their land the greatest possible net revenue, with the least worry and uncertainty, and without considering whether the type of exploitation which gave him this advantage, would ensure a livelihood for the poor or not. This calculation is all too common, if not universal today, that no one doubts an owner's right to do so. However these are its consequences which have plunged the entire state into out and out misery, made society lose its security, that have degraded the national character, and which today form the most difficult obstacles to overcome in the recovery of Culture.

Not only in the state of the Church, but in the kingdom of Naples, in most of Italy, so many families were placed in a condition where work isn't obtainable; so that their idleness destroyed not only their moral dignity, but that it shakes that of the whole nation, completely erasing all shame attached to dirt, to misery, and to begging. Men who have no longer a fixed vocation, who live from day to day, who vainly seek the work that is rarely granted, accustomed to regard alms as their natural resource, and who consider idleness as the only well-being they know. In southern Italy one never lets one's eyes fall on a common man, for this is a sign to him to stretch out his hand and beg, even when he had the means to devote some

care to himself; he is careful not to abstain from cleanliness altogether in his misery, which can be of use to him to solicit charity. Often we find it difficult to understand how the rags with which he is covered can remain attached together. In most cities of the Roman state, at least a third of the population seems doomed to idleness. It's hard to imagine the number of able-bodied men that in the winter, in Rome, are seen lying in the sun, while in other seasons or other places the beggars' pale and skinny faces or trembling fever, let you know enough about everything that they have to suffer. Habit however, hardens the hearts of those who could give.

Everyone feels so well that it is impossible for one to relieve, even for a day, the misery one incessantly has under the eyes, that one does not even make an attempt to do what one could do. At the corner of every street, the one who isn't ragged himself, repeatedly hears: 'Hò fame, muoio dalla fame', and these words, 'j'ai faim, je meurs de faim', which, in a foreign language would get him such a lively impression anywhere else, here it only comes over as a banal expression, a borrowed suit, dressed as well as rags, so as to arouse public commiseration; while it is only too much true that many actually suffer from hunger, that in a country where the land is so abundant and food so cheap, many actually die from the deprivations of the ultimate misery.

But if such is their destitution, why, it will be said, is it necessary to call up so many day laborers every year from Abbruzzo and the Marshes? Why are the days sustained at a price that would be high even in countries where food is much more expensive? Why can't the 'piazzauioli', these

crossroads' beggars, be busy in the harvests by cutting up and putting away the straws?

To understand the rationalizations of the common man, it is necessary to consider the problem as society has made it; we must admit that there are consequences to the vices that our very institutions have imposed on us. As long as man has honor and a feeling of his independence, he will submit to great privations, he will

78

show himself capable of great efforts rather than degrading himself by begging; but if he has reached his arm out once, he will be ready to stretch it unceasingly; his place is the now, and by this single act, he has marked it for himself in society; he would refrain for weeks or months from resorting to public charity, so that his place in it would not change. Now, the man without a vocation, without a future, who is only called for a few days, a few weeks at most of working in the fields, knows very well that in Rome, before long he will have to beg anew. A slightly higher wage, that possibly is even continued for a few months, will not make him give up his filth and rags, as well as his moral degradation. This external degradation has now become a habit for him, and he no longer feels it like that. Accumulating by foresight cannot enter into his thoughts anymore, as he has now been accustomed not to know a tomorrow any more. So only his physical sensations in the now remain to be compared; with his wage he will have more food, more drinks than that begging produces, but he will also be more tired; and as a consequence of society having become accustomed to refusing him any kind of steady work, he has become accustomed to the feeling of fatigue having become a real suffering. The work that is asked of him in summer increases the chances of illnesses; and when he refuses to go, for a few 'pauls' a week, for in the mean time having exposed himself to malaria fevers, that won't lead him to his grave until after years of languor, he is no doubt making a wise calculation. To raise the character of anyone, it is not the present that must be given to him, it is the future. When he measures his life by the day, he also limits his desires to the very coarsest of pleasures; but by giving back to him the sense of duration of pleasure, if we can make him feel of having a heritage in time, we will soon raise his character; for all moral ideas, still for him too, are tied up with foresight, all duties relate to what must happen one day. The more the Roman has been degraded by its local institutions, the more energetic means must be employed to raise it back up again; and the more it is necessary to convey a sense of solidity that his hopes are indeed realizable. Whatever disastrous effects the current conditions are having on the character of the English day laborer,

79

not the poor tax, but the daily wage which made the poverty tax necessary, still in his memories, in his habits however, enough traces of his former independence, enough taste for order and for cleanliness, enough respect

for himself remains; which is enough to give him a glimpse of hope and the probability of a regular job, and the spring of his soul will recover, and the need for consideration, independence, order, and economy will direct his conduct. But the Roman has been lying in the mire for too long, to be able to straighten himself out; he will not hope for ownership before he actually holds it; he will not understand a duration of well-being until he is enjoying it; instead he will only fear the degradation of his begging when he needs to change his whole being. In the days when work always was assured of a reward, and when only great catastrophes, calamities which made work impossible, reduced a man to beg for alms, the institution of mendicant orders perhaps was born from a beautiful idea: as it called for respect of a man unhappy enough to have to live off public charity. But today the way that leads to begging is too broad and too easy; far from calling on religion to ameliorate it, it is necessary to multiply the public supports for the poor, so that he does not let himself be drawn into it. Support of this kind, a social organization that called on each citizen to live under the gaze of others, to kindle a respect in others, formerly existed in the Roman state, or rather IT still exists, although this organization has lost its influence, it was the character of townspeople imprinted on the farmers. Agriculture, carried out by families who enter the city walls every evening, doubtlessly is not without drawbacks; it decreases the affection of peasants for the soil and a diligence of their care; it prohibits many of the crops most prone to pilferage; it makes it almost impossible to transport night soil for fertilizer, and this must undoubtedly be attributed to the loss or abandonment of this great means of fertilization throughout the Roman state; and finally, it wastes a lot of time for both men and teams. But,

80

on the other hand, the gathering of men in villages is the most powerful means of civilizing them. This way of life teaches them that they have many common interests, and duties to be exercised towards one another; it provides them with mutual services in the event of accidents or illnesses; in countries where the government would be powerless to save them, it provides for the defense of their people and their property from robbery; it puts at their fingertips: medical, religious, and educational aids, which the rural folks dispersed in the fields must almost dispense with, or at least they are unable to obtain them without a great deal of wasted time and considerable expense; and finally, it accustoms the cultivators to show more respect for public opinion, to submit more to the rules of cleanliness and decency, and therefore it teaches them to enjoy life better and to make themselves more worthy of it.

In the state to which *Agro Romano* is reduced, it has become a necessity for farmers to inhabit cities. If their homes were scattered in the fields, they would there be endlessly exposed to being stripped by vagabonds who roam the territory alone, and who present themselves in turn as shepherds, as day laborers asking for work, as beggars, or openly as brigands. Most of the villages were built in a time of greater opulence; those who inhabit them today would have taken less care to the salubrity

of their homes, or would not have built them so vast; as they very rarely call the carpenter or mason to repair them, they sadden almost all by their state of degradation. Likewise, on the inside, the dirt and disorder contrast with the habits of Tuscan people; however, we find all the same a certain abundance of the things most necessary for life: cookware, part in copper part in common earthenware; the beds, tables, chairs, cupboards, attest that the owner has some superfluity to dispose of, and that he cares something about appearances, as well as to life's real needs; and if his wife is a good housewife, her wardrobes are filled with linen clothes, bed linen, which she has woven and

81

spun herself in the winter evenings, and that she works at to ever increase. But formerly the general ease, which today is rapidly decreasing, was still manifested in the costumes specific to every little town and village. When we saw Rome for the first time, thirty years ago now, the infinite variety of costumes which, on feast days, enlivened the Corso, or the processions, was not one of its lesser charms. Some were remarkable for their elegance, others for their quirkiness, all for a certain pretension to wealth. We saw that twenty different peoples, each of whom was proud of his heritage, and eager not to be confused with the others, had arranged an engagement with the big capital. The artists regret this variety, which brought out so many beautiful faces; today, the beggars' outfit seems to have replaced all other; pallor, thinness, hardly recognizable on faces disfigured by famine or disease the features that once characterized the Sabines, the Latins, or the Volscians. The human species, as we see it in the streets of Rome, has undoubtedly become bastardized; which is inevitable effect of suffering and laziness. Its distinguishing features appear to be more to its advantage in the small towns of Lazio and Sabine; and indeed, as much as we can trust the information that we have endeavored to take in, the food is more abundant and more succulent there than in Rome. Good bread, soup, beans and 'polenta' form the basis; the farmer adds a little meat on feast days, a little fish on lean days; during the winter, he usually drinks 'vinella' or fermented water soaked in the dregs from which the wine was extracted; wine, which generally is good and nourishing, is saved for the summer. True enough for laborers, the nourishment is more badly divided; they work on empty stomachs until noon, even though doctors have been recommending not to expose oneself to bad air with an empty stomach; at noon they eat a piece of dry bread, with a few herbs they pull up in the fields, without oil, vinegar,

82

nor salt; in the evening, when they come home, a hot soup awaits them, again with bread and wine; it is this wine which provides all the seasoning and all the pleasure of their food. In these small towns, as well as in Rome, the identifying local costumes have almost completely disappeared, and it

is not only their picturesque effect, but their moral influence that we have come to regret. These costumes maintained, between the inhabitants of the same city, an esprit de corps, a reciprocal esteem, a constant attention not to degrade the region, whose sort of uniform was worn. The inhabitant of Albano or Tivoli suffered if he saw the insignia of Albano or of Travoli dragged by a compatriot through the mud. Out of pride he offered him a helping hand, if he did not do so by compassion. These costumes cost more than the current clothes, but the local peasantry can obviously afford to indulge. As much as the splendor of the rich is distressing, so much the comfort of the peasants rejoices us; because the superfluity is always the same, whether it is employed to flatter the pride of a few, or to spread its pleasures among the greater number.

We have sought to understand what the state of this urban population is today, which alone takes part in the agriculture of its native region, and why it is so desirable to see its work extended, its 'improvements' on a larger area of land, and to see at the same time increases both in number and in ease. We saw that wherever industry is shown, where it recalled the soil to its fertility, it owed its progress to the division of landed property made in its favor; to an always very limited division as to its extent, most often very costly in terms of its conditions, but which nevertheless always gave the peasant the feeling of property and perpetuity. Wherever, so far, we observed this sharing, it was the work of the Middle Ages, however; it was the consequence of the gentleman's desire to procure faithful vassals, soldiers for his private wars. Since feudal independence ceased,

83

we saw the big landowners, whose military ambition was forbidden, to listen only to their greed or their jealousy towards the bourgeois who had ceased to be their vassals. From then on they absolutely refused to do any new sharing of land, to relinquish any part of their property in perpetuity. On the contrary, they pushed back with suspicion any attempt at culture that might have been made on their barren lands; they successively forced all sharecroppers who were still there to abandon them, and they sought to redeem, to round up, all the plots of cultivated and enclosed property that the petty bourgeoisie showed themselves willing to sell.

But we still have to make one exception that is well known and worthy of note to this esprit de corps of the Roman princes, a return of one of them, almost of our time, to the politics of the Middle Ages. In the ancient land of the Eques, behind Mount Albano and on one of the last foothills of the Sabine Mountains lies Zagarolo Castle, twenty-five miles from Rome. It used to be, as well as Palestrina, which is close by, a stronghold of the Colonnas, but the prince Rospigliosi inherited it. Zagarolo's air itself is healthy, but immediately below it we enter the deserted plain where the fever reigns. The Castle contained three or four thousand rather miserable inhabitants, who were confined to a territory much too small, the remains of the old emphyteutic concessions of the Colonna, when, around the year 1800, the administrators of the Rospigliosi heritage, seduced by the high prize that wheat had reached, consented to yield, in emphyteusis to these

inhabitants, plots of land hitherto deserted, to put them under cultivation. These peasants, who then had to pay at least 12 ecus for a rubbio of grain, thought they would gain by promising the same sum annually for a rubbi of land that would produce them at least eight grain rubbios at harvest. Because this work was rarely if ever requested, they did not scrupulously calculate what their own work would cost them, but in any case it would be a gain for them, and a sure bet to place it. In general,

84

each farmer asked the prince's agent for as many rubbi field as he had working members in his family; and he received them in their wild state, without enclosure, without ditches, without trees, producing only natural grass, interspersed with brambles and ferns: and he promised in return an annual canon which varied from 5 to 12 ecus, depending on the nature of the land and its distance, but which unfortunately was stipulated in money and not in wheat, which made it very expensive for the peasants when the wheat fell in price. On the other hand, the concession was perpetual, as in Rome neither the limitation to four lives as is customary in Tuscany, nor the 'laudemio' for the renewal of the contract is known. As soon, however, as the inhabitants of Zagarolo had this title to territorial property acquired, these same men, that we had seen in bad years flood the streets of Rome to beg for alms, which we had judged too weak to work, so unable to endure the great fatigue attached to cultivation in a hot climate, began to break up the ground and to seed it. During several years they could not expect any other return than the annual harvests of wheat; however they did not limit themselves to plowing, they took advantage, with a view to the future, of all the moments, of all the efforts that their present status allowed for. They surrounded their new property with fences; they ensured the flow of water by digging ditches; in the middle of wheat fields they planted the olive tree, the fig tree, fruit trees of all kinds, but especially the vine. For five or six years grains, the only sale-able products of their fields, were dearly bought by their sweats, and they had to live on privations, but they were sustained by hope. At the end of this term the vines came into full production, and it is those now that pay the rent: the produce of all the other trees is growing every year, although they still have not reached their full development. During the first years all the cultivators came back every evening to sleep at Zagarolo, in their old dwellings; but these soon began to regain some semblance of order and

85

of cleanliness. Later, most of them raised, in the middle of the land they had acquired, a few huts or sheds of foliage where they took their meals, and where they could rest during the extreme heat of the day, or take cover during thunderstorms. Then several of these huts began to turn into proper houses, next the population descended into the countryside, and especially those who would have too far to go, do not go back and no longer sleep in the village. This population has grown considerably as well as having been

enriched; today it has passed eight thousand inhabitants. 'Maglioramento', or the real property of the cultivator in his improvements to the land, sells for at least at two times the value of the original fund, so that the poor inhabitants of Zagarolo, who were supposed to have no capital, fixed on the ground, in over thirty years have amassed a capital twice as large as the total value of the land that had been alienated from them in previous generations. They made agricultural advances that none of the rich owners of the fiefdom had been able to make in the course of many centuries, and that its prince would also be unable to do so today.

As a social experiment, the exploitation of the Zagarolo countryside, by emphyteutic lease, was fully successful. A considerable expanse of barren land has been returned to a rich culture by the inhabitants of the local soil themselves, and without assistance, without foreign capital; the value of buildings has tripled, the population has doubled, its wealth has greatly increased, the food that it previously lacked was produced in abundance, the idleness to which its people was often condemned has been given way to constant and lucrative work; crimes have become rarer and the policing easier and less expensive; commerce has been proportional to the increase in production and consumption, and all such contributions have been more than advantageous. Foodstuffs however have fallen to about half the price of what they were worth in 1800, and the cultivators are burdened with cannons that are too considerable. It would have much better for them if these were stipulated in wheat. It would have been better

86

even for the prince, whose revenue would have been paid more accurately. Prince Rospigliosi, however, is not happy. He does not live in Zagarolo; he is too great a lord to concern himself with the collection of all these small rents; he has thus an agent, or rather a sub-agent who is responsible for his perception of the state of affairs. And it is this sub-agent who complains about the infinite administrative details, about the delays he experiences in getting his rent money; and the prince declares that he would much rather have a lower revenue, but to receive it without having to worry about it, without difficulties, at fixed deadlines, just as he got paid earlier by the rich 'mercante di campagna' before he closed his grazing lands to them. Consequently, although new requests to obtain lands in emphyteusis from him come in every day, not only on the hillsides, but in the plain, below Zagarolo as well, he does not grant any, or with extreme difficulty; and he has not introduced this operating system of cultivation in any of the other fiefdoms which belong to him.

Both results are equally worthy of observation and the study of: how to return the Roman Campagna to culture, using the existing population, and with the only capital it possesses; all based on the circumstances found in the country itself, at that very time, with all the conditions that one judges in advance to be able to make it difficult; so that it will meet the economic goal of increasing production and wealth, from the moral goal of getting rid of laziness, increasing happiness, and respect for the law, to the social goal of raising the living standards of the members of the present Roman

society, rather than making use of foreigners in their stead, and with the financial aim of increasing the contributions paid to the sovereign, so as to reduce his expenses. But this mode of improvement thwarts the tastes and habits even more than the interests of the owner of any one province.

What should we conclude from this, except that it is a great misfortune for the nation when a province has but a single owner?

In our century, people generally still hold a resentment against the power

87

formerly exercised by the noblemen in their castles; and, in return, the nobility is annoyed at not finding among the poor, who live on or around its land, either the affection or the deference that in earlier times, the vassals showed their lords; forgetting however, that they themselves severed these old ties.

In truly feudal times, a Colonna lived in Zagarolo, another in Palestrina, another in Montefortino; and not one of the castles in the province was deprived of the presence of his lord. Doubtless this chief, freed from all surveillance, from all fear, sometimes abused his authority that in fact, was absolute. He was the judge as well as the captain of his vassals, and there was no recourse against his injustices or his whims. But throughout the population of his castle there existed a constant emulation; he distributed favors as well as punishments; he knew each of the inhabitants by name, and he knew what they were capable of. At the very least, he encouraged certain talents, certain merits. At the same time as his constant presence created this moral movement among his vassals and helped to civilize them, all kinds of village industry were encouraged by the market they would find in his home; products from the sheepfold, mulch, garden, from the orchard, were carried to his kitchen; the village craftsmen were used to manufacture, or at least to restore, his accommodation, his furnishings, his clothes, and his weapons. Each of his vassals contributed to his share of his revenue, but this revenue he respent in turn among his vassals; his presence and that of his family were for everyone in the village a continual cause of life and wealth. And the lady of the castle, providing her care and medication, to the benefit of the poor and the sick, regained the hearts of even those who had had their disagreements with the lord himself.

But, now, what does Prince Rospigliosi do for the inhabitants of Zagarolo?

He is just an obstacle to their happiness, and nothing more.

Furthermore, a man they don't know, don't ever see,

88

who has not made a single one of them work in his house, did not spend anything on them for other services, and who however, in turn, either forbade them to cultivate his wasteland, or only conceded it to them at a costly royalty. However this prince could well be an enlightened man, benevolent, generous; a distinguished member of the Roman aristocracy. He is not personally to blame if the links are broken between Zagarolo's inhabitants and him, it is due to the organization of modern society, it is

due to the entire system that created the 'latifundia', as at the time when the Roman republic ended, which united the fiefdoms of ten, twenty small lords into one principality, which concentrated in a single owner a number of castles scattered several days apart, condemning the peasants to their lord always being an absent proprietor and in having become a Roman. But the aristocracy uprooting itself from the countryside, and giving up blooming on the ground from which it drew its sap, condemned itself to perish at the same time. The chatelaine nobility had in the affections, in habits, in mutual services, an indestructible power; but when it moved into the capital, while it may still retain political influence, it will be much more artificial. Since it became cosmopolitan, since that it only thinks of enjoying itself, and shining in all the places where pleasure attracts it to be, it has finished breaking the ties that still attached it to the countries from which it derives its revenue.

If the division of land into properties held under emphyteutic lease to its lords, although it ensures the prosperity of the country, yet does not appeal to the owners of the fiefdoms; this doesn't mean that this sharing is bad, it is that these owners will need to be reformed. If the prince were a less powerful lord, he would take care of the cannons' impressions himself, or, at the very least, he could inspect the accounts of his agent; he would better coordinate his own take, with the need of his tenants to pay taxes; and he would expose them less to falling behind. All of which tends to increasingly concentrate the large properties into even larger ones, as well as tending to increasingly impoverish the State of Rome. Any

change in legislation, on the contrary, which will gradually share the great fortunes, will contribute to the general prosperity of the country, and even to the maintenance or to the increase in the influence of the aristocracy on the poor population. One only steers, one only gets attached to those one knows. The aristocracy, so powerful in the Middle Ages, was distributed over the entire surface of the land; and since then the great lords no longer belong to any one country, they have ceased everywhere to have inferiors who devote themselves to them.

The legislation of inheritance and partitions between brothers, however, and the action that the sovereign authority should exercise on the largest fortunes, to bring them closer to the common level, are not part of our current objective. At the moment we are concerned with taking care of the poor, the farmer, the craftsman, and the destitute in Rome, more unhappy still, who can neither be farmer nor craftsman. It's for them that the shown example of Zagarolo is important; it is for them that one proves that the remedy for current ailments is where it could always have been found, in the division of land among cultivators. This partition was made in the time of the Latins, the Sabines, the Romans, royalty free, and it created the highest prosperity that this country has ever arisen to. It was done in the eleventh and twelfth century, by the lords of the castles and their vassals, under the obligation of personal services, and it brought into being an agricultural and warrior population; it was made, in 1780, by the Grand

Duke Leopold, against royalties in commodities, and under his direction the marshes of Tuscany were drained from under the water, and covered with a vigorous and prosperous population. This division was made in 1800 by Prince Rospigliosi, and it doubled the population and quadrupled the value of heritage funds in Zagarolo; and finally this division could, from century to century, be carried out without difficulty and without infringing on property.

One may have noticed that we did not induce any abstract principles; we did not want to deduce a theory from those; we have confined ourselves, both in this Essay and in the preceding one, to the study of the facts; we wanted to understand the

90

Roman Campagna, and what, over the centuries, had been done for or against its usefulness to society. It seems to us, in fact, that this study has reached its end, and that it traces a clear enough outline of the rest of the things to do. We do not see that it is necessary to hesitate; only one goal is possible, only one goal is copacetic with the justice due to the inhabitants of the Roman state, with the circumspection, which only allows one to move forward step by step; with humanitarianism, which today does not want to risk either the health or the happiness of the colonists, to achieve a dubious good in the future. This is the goal proposed by Pope Pius VII, when he issued his edict of 1802: to find a center of current activity in the population of each city, and extend this activity out into the barrens; first close to its walls, then successively over an ever larger area, as the culture reaches concentric circles one after another, and continues to expand until it meets those of neighboring towns.

It also seems to us that there is only one way to reach this goal, the one whose influence has been recognized in all previous centuries, and one that has never been attempted without getting a full success: the guarantee, to the cultivator, of perpetual property as the fruit of his sweats. We know that servile work, like mercenary labor, is seldom worth its reward. We also know that true wealth, true strength, the happiness of nations, in the final analysis is built on a large rural population. We know that the love of property, the confidence in perpetuity, and the intelligence of one who works for one's own account, triumphs over the most rebellious nature. And we finally know that for twenty centuries the 'latifundia' ruined Italy and the provinces. Also, as the tribunes of ancient Rome did, we demand an agrarian law, because it is only on a fair sharing of land that a social prosperity can be founded; but we don't ask for it with the same intention in mind as they wanted their law, bringing with it a spoliation, since it is on the contrary a respect for the property and its perpetuity, which seem to us the necessary bases of agriculture. Together we call for land sharing

91

and a respect for vested rights. While lamenting the extent of territorial property in the Roman state, we want their owners to keep everything they

possess today; and have the full value of the fruits that this land naturally produces. But we want society to return to the law that it has never been able to alienate; to wit: the one of existence; which is the right to extract produce from the earth that cultivation and care would set in motion be assured, and that the current owners refuse to the human species.

We admit to the distinction between direct domain and the usufructuary domain, which forms the basis of the emphyteutic contract. And without looking for either examples in other times, or foreign practices, we have shown Zagarolo, and we say that nothing prevents the Agro Romano from being returned to agriculture, private property, intelligence and happiness, by the same process which has been shown feasible to implement and be successful in that set of circumstances.

Let it not be believed that the living condition of long-term cultivators, of those who acquire the useful domain of the land, while paying an annual recognition to owners of its direct domain, is significantly worse than is the condition of the cultivators of Lazio, when, after a subdivision of these once wastelands, they obtained full ownership, without paying any royalty to anyone. Any society that has been willing to grant itself an exclusive right over the land, that nature granted to all, like its air, water, and fire, has however always attached some onerous condition to this concession that it has guaranteed. The Latin citizen was obliged to bear arms for his homeland for free, and defend it against its neighbors in wars that were renewed almost every year. Such an obligation was at least equal to a pecuniary royalty, and those who will commit to pay a rubbio, or a rubbio and a half, of wheat per rubbi of land to his lord, will have acquired their funds on one condition; which will not be more expensive than that of the division of the first Latin peoples.

Rome, even today, seems less of a big city than a collection of poor villages, in the midst of which there are many palaces and magnificent temples. Rome, with its flocks of animals wandering in the streets, its haylofts, its attics, its cellars, even its manure; these places and conditions all invoke the inscription, 'immondezzaio', as seemingly a city dedicated to the cultivation of the fields. It is home to forty, or forty five, thousand unemployed inhabitants who ask for work and who have hardly any hope of finding any; they are housed in the city, miserably no doubt; however, they are assured of cover, and there is no lack of space. If we could give them a rural industry, and the modest affluence that follows with that, they would soon find a way to use their home to work their fields. It is with these forty or fifty thousand inhabitants that we must begin to repopulate the countryside. We must neither deport them, nor violate their habits, nor think of building houses for them. Just give them the biggest incentive that industry has to offer, the feeling of property, and soon the love of order, of working in the economy will follow suit.

Even less is it appropriate to want to do everything at the same time. It is never wise to effect a big change in popular customs either, to run the risk of clashing with prejudices, and breaking habits, of which we do not know

all its consequences. We said that the Agro Romano, in the sense of being true to its name, consisted of 111,600 squares rubbi. No doubt we would like to see the time when each of the destitute inhabitants of Rome would own one of these rubbi, but of course, distributing those to them now isn't what we propose to do. When Pope Pius VII had the wasteland, beyond the frontier of the lands endorsed and cultivated at present, surveyed in its extension of a one mile radius, he found that these contained 4,792 rubbi. It's to this initial area that we would now like to limit the granting of new emphyteutic leases. Experience has taught us that this distance doesn't present a problem at all, and that the vineyards, orchards and fields can be cultivated without difficulty by those who

93

have their domicile in the city. Moreover, we would distinguish still further between these lands. Between them there are 47 rubbi that belong to the Papal State treasury or to the apostolic chamber, 1,860 to pious foundations, and 2,885 to lay people. We would leave the last ones as they are for a while, so that the experiment would be done only on 1,907 rubbi which the pontifical government can dispose of in an absolute way. As it recently helped buy back at 4 percent, perpetual annuities payable to pious foundations, and it is committed to pay to itself this capital; it will show a lot more respect for their property, and it will leave them more security for their future, if it retains the direct domain ownership of all their land, with all the revenue they get from it annually, and if it only imposes on them the condition of alienating the useful domain, without adding anything to or subtracting from its current rent, but by valuing this rent in wheat, in order to not be bothered the variations in its price which could in turn be harmful to one or the other contracting party.

In this way, the apostolic chamber would have to concede 1,907 rubbi of land, within a mile radius from Rome, in a perpetual emphyteutic lease, for an annual cannon that probably would not exceed 1,200 rubbio of wheat, or two thirds of a rubbio of wheat for each rubbi of land. It would have to share the land among five or six hundred families, by reason of each rubbi of land being workable by an individual of the proper age and condition. As this project would not be exceptionally large, the chamber could choose among those who would ask to participate in this welfare proposal, and she should bind itself to those who seem the most intelligent and fit to do rural work, the most industrious, the most eager, and the most at their ease. If we want all future projects to be successful, it is above all essential that this holds true for the first settlers, thus that they demonstrate virtues and industry, and that in choosing them this cannot be tainted in any way with favors suggesting of mercantile speculation. Also, under no circumstances should a family get more land than it can exploit under the usual circumstances.

At the time of land clearing and preparation, several of them no doubt will call on additional workers for help, they will thus need to offer a wage to the indigent, and will make townspeople adapt to learning rural work. But

this initial cooperation, in breaking ground, must be temporary. We must not forget for a moment that the goal of sharing land must be to remove men from laziness, like the fields from lying fallow; that it is a call to waken industry and to a diligence that the spirit of property evokes; and that it will only be fully successful in as much as it will suppress the work of day laborers.

In operations of this kind it is essential not to hurry; one must give popular opinions the time to slowly form; the experience must enlighten those to what theoretical considerations could never accomplish; everyone's eyes must be struck by the fact that success isn't arguable.

The ground for the five or six hundred new farms will not all be cleared in the same year; it will take another five or six years for the vines that will be planted there to begin to correspond to the expectations of farmers. And it won't be until after this term has also expired that secular owners may be required to accede in perpetual emphyteutic leases, and under the same conditions, the 2,885 rubbi of land located within the first mile radius and belonging to them.

But from now on, they must be made to understand that culture is an essential condition of property; and that if they do not perform the 'miglioramento' themselves, society then has the right to demand it, and they must expect with certainty that emphyteutic sharing will be imposed on them; and that indeed, this sharing is projected to begin around each small town, in the same proportion as around Rome, so that the revival of activity may be the same everywhere.

Pope Pius VII's 'motu proprio' has sufficiently warned the owners, more than thirty years ago, that such was their duty. They do not meet any of the conditions that society imposed on the real owners; they have, on the other hand, none of their enjoyments. They are owed an annuity on the land,

that they can keep; but it's an annuity that they themselves reduced to the value of the natural products of the soil, so that by its nature it must have decreased over time rather than increased; it is therefore to their advantage to gracefully declare it invariable. But as society has consented to the appropriation of the land, it only guaranteed so under the condition of encouraging all long-term work to those who would be making it productive. It has long since been proven that these arrangements, on which the subsistence and the life of all depends, were subverted and prevented the latter from factually occurring. Proprietors once were the representatives and curators of the nation, but they took advantage of their ownership to drive the nation out of its homes. If now, despite themselves, their land will finally receive the improvements that will create a public prosperity, it would be absurd to claim that this must be due to their benevolence. To them the perpetuity of what they have always contended themselves with; to the colonists, in perpetuity, the product of their labors.

The secular lands, located within the precincts of the first mile around Rome should be distributed the first after the Church owned lands; but it is not in this immediate neighborhood that the restoration of culture must stop. Beyond this circle, the various ecclesiastical corporations hold again, in the Agro Romano, 39,999 rubbi of land; while the secular owners hold in the same territory 66,314 rubbi; the division of land, which will not take anything away from anybody, that will not infringe on any of the existing rights, must be extended successively to the whole of this province. Finally, all of the four provinces which lie to the south-east of the Tiber have a combined surface area of 2,844 square miles, or 341,580 rubbi. To the northwest of the Tiber, the Patrimonio covers an extent of 1,037 square miles, or 124,440 rubbi. We do not know which portion, of this immense expanse of territory, belongs to the Church, and how much to the secular princes; but we do know that almost all of it is presently deserted and uncultivated, and that, as a whole, it calls for the same legislation. Everywhere farmers, by fertilizing the soil, could be living in a modest abundance, if we had the present of mind to allow it; their contributions would fill the pontifical treasury, while it

is now exhausted in maintaining some sort of guarding force in the middle of the deserts, some traversable roads extending immense distances from the dwellings, some charity, some help for the poor, where everyone asks, and where no one is able to give. In turn, the cultivators, by their needs, by their consumption, would awaken the industry of the towns and make it prosper. The papal state at last would recover entirely from its desolation. The renewal of the population, in the first radius of a mile around Rome, would probably make it easier for any operation tending to subsequently carry it beyond that; but it shouldn't be expected to happen all by itself. There is no reason for expecting owners to imitate voluntarily the example which will have been given to them. Probably, at least we hope, a few will do so, as having maintained a few good country gentlemen in the country, to serve as examples of what we understand a great culture is all about; but most will not resolve by themselves to do what the Church will have done. The interest that they developed for themselves are too far removed from the public interests; they run contrary to their habits and their tastes that they are determined to enjoy, if and when they want to do so; and they will never consider themselves to be rich enough to indulge in them all. In any country, the possessions of the nobility are in land, not in available capital. Among the Roman nobles, there are, true enough, some capitalists, but it is precisely those who also own the most land; and a person who owns land worth a million ecus, can at most dispose of one hundred thousand ecus in cash. He would need three million ecus however, to develop these lands; because, as we have seen, the improvement, 'il miglioramento', must at least triple the value of the land. Also, as long as the possessions are disproportionately extensive, their owners will prefer to deal with a single 'mercante di campagna', rather than with two hundred, perhaps even with two thousand emphyteutic lease holders; they will prefer the net

and invariable product of the uncultivated pasture to all the yields of the most carefully attended culture.

It is therefore necessary that the sovereign authority intervenes

97

to impose conditions on them; but this very necessity makes it imperative for the sovereign to engage in this activity slowly and with great care. It is only to get a great public advantage that it can violate private interests; this advantage could be taken from him by a line of reasoning which does not directly depend on political economy. In its current state, the Roman Campagna is certainly unhealthy, and no increase in potential wealth can compensate for the formation of a population destined in having to fight as a matter of course with malaria fever, and thus to die without ever having enjoyed a better life. One must therefore be careful not to accelerate its establishment in the fields too much, because any failure in colonization would turn public opinion against all attempts at improvement.

Cultivation of the radius of a mile extended from Rome, through perpetual emphyteutic leases, made under royalties which leave comfort and ease to the cultivator, will however enlighten on the measures to be taken next. It will teach the farmers themselves how to implement the most profitable system of cultivation and what it is, from their present position, still away from their property; what is the kind of lifestyle that can best protect their health; it will teach what the market needs are, and what the work load will be so that can be carried by the farmer. It will provide an opportunity to better study the causes of bad air, its modification possibilities once the cultivation starts, and the means to preserve it. It is probable that the result of these observations will confirm, but not right away, the preference for agriculture which we have called “urban”; and that the convenience will be felt of creating successively ever larger circles of improvement in the Roman Campagna, and in the enclosed villages or towns (*castelli*), for which the healthiest conditions on the hills will be chosen, there where the waters are the best, and which are the easiest to gain access to. There, one hundred families will be gathered, between which the surrounding land will be shared; never giving any family more than which was sufficient for the comfort of the Roman citizens; which used to amount to seven ‘jugera’ or one ‘rubbi’ of land for each working individual. These families reunited in a common enclosure, with their parish priest and their doctor, can more easily protect themselves together against any

98

robberies in their fields. They will be able to exercise some policing over each other, and in particular looking after the ownership of their common buildings. Houses built on a regular grid and leaning against each other, will require fewer walls, less in perimeter fencing, and will need to do less transportation than if these were scattered in the fields. The inhabitants will more easily be able to both offer and receive mutual aid for work in the fields; and if one of them experiences some accident, if one of them

becomes sick or incapacitated, he will not be exposed to languish and perish in an isolated house, far from any other dwelling.

A good legislator must keep in mind the pleasures of life for his people, almost as much as their needs; he must not forget that contentment is the nourishment for the soul, and that this is almost as important as food is needed for the body. He must moreover think that among the Italians, much more so than among other peoples, there is a pressing need to come together; that the profound sadness of being alone, in the middle of the deserts, would make them vulnerable to all sorts of diseases; and that this condition would make them all worse, while social life in a village will be the health of the new settlers.

Let us thus focus on individual interests. When small colonies will have multiplied; when the desire to extend the partitioning of land into smaller farms will have become more generally accepted; when we begin to want cultivating wheat fields, rather than to stick to natural pastures; when the wealthy owners come to live in the fields and run their own cultivation, we will also see the houses descending from the hillsides into the plain, and the farmers build on their smallholdings as they are already building homes around Zagarolo.

Let's go and do it!... when one sees the path ahead so clearly traced out, one always experiences a moment of illusion, and one imagines that wishes alone are enough to get where one wants to go. So, let's do it! Alas! nothing will happen at all. However, after having fixed one's eyes for some time on a sight of desolation, one feels some relief to think that the remedy is at hand; that it should not be

sought in abstract principles, in an untested theory, but that it is there in front of the eyes, guaranteed by experiences of the present time, by those of all times preceding it, and that is missing is the will to apply it.

TWELFTH ESSAY

The Colonies

We do not propose to present to the public, in these Essays, a complete course in Political Economy, but only attach a few questions, which seem to us to have been neglected by previous writers, or noted without having paid sufficient attention as to their effects on the happiness and ongoing perfection of humanity.

One should therefore not be surprised if we leave some of them alone altogether, about which we feel that we have nothing new or important to say; about a few others, we only talk incidentally; while to a third group, attention is devoted that may seem disproportionate. Each of these Essays should, in some respects, be considered as a separate book; their order is arbitrary, up to a point; and the whole that they form cannot be a regular one. One idea though, or maybe we should say a single feeling, is found throughout our system, and in this sentiment lies what we must seek the sequence of this publication is all about. We wanted to shift the attention of things to men; to not lose sight for a moment that men are the goal of the social sciences, and that things should be considered as objects by those who study them, only insofar as providing the means of progress and bliss to humanity. Our predecessors, seduced by a more scientific method of abstractions, believed they could investigate the object of wealth as a science, and consider it

increasing or declining, regardless of its effects, especially of its moral effects, on the men amongst whom it is being shared. On the contrary, we rejected the metaphysics of it all which seemed deceptive to us; we avoided the language of science, and its definitions, which so often generate errors; then, focusing instead on the effects of such supposed wealth generation on human society, we noticed all the symptoms of its increased suffering, as well as we analyzed the causes as to why it was experiencing those evils.

Man has been destined to work by his nature and his position on this earth; and the foremost work that caught our attention, is that to which we owe all our substance, almost all the pleasures we enjoy, indeed the whole of our existence. It is the work of agriculture, so our primal concern has been with the men who are devoted to working in the fields, creating territorial wealth. The purpose of economics did not seem to us to be to teach them how to draw the greatest mass of value from the soil, nor to reap the maximum net profits for their operation, but to ensure that prudence directed this work, that charity presided over its distribution and that of its fruits, and that justice shields from oppression those who execute that work.

Then, looking at prosperous societies, we saw almost everywhere that land was lacking to the plowman, either because the rich had suppressed access to part of it in reservation for their own enjoyment, or that all fields likely to provide humans with useful products would already have been cultured. When those conditions reign, or even only when those rich imagine having reached it, the focus of investigation shifts to those regions of the globe where humanity has been stopped its development, where its institutions have kept it in barbarism and misery, and where vast barrens seem to call for farmers from outside the region. Each observant is then ready to ask if it is fair or not that those who have received from nature so many means to live happily but are denied the opportunity to make use of them; while those who have such an immense

102

superfluity of something they seem to dislike, share it with other men who are in dire need of it.

Thus the study of territorial wealth development leads to the question of new settlements; as these present themselves first of all as one of the means of exploiting this territorial wealth.

Indeed, it is through colonies that men can distribute such over the face of the earth, by means of which they can restore the balance between their number and their needs; and by which means they can highlight what was abandoned, and appropriate the constant work of nature by fertilizing it. But although the colonies can be considered simply in their chrematistic understanding, as a means of creating or accumulating wealth; it's also a restrictive way, and therefore quite wrong to consider one of the most important things that men can impose on other men, an action that can sometimes be in accordance with the intent of Providence to have progress and a civilizing of humanity, and at other times, on the contrary, can spread among a people still naive and unspoiled the vices of old societies. Their influence, either for good or for evil, is so energetic, with colonies having contributed so much throughout history to change the face of the earth, that we cannot limit its analysis to purely chrematistic influences; and that in this Essay we will focus our attention only on examining the results of colonization, what these could accomplish for the development of mankind, as the beneficial 'rule of the house and the community' is introduced from place to place and with new nations. It must concern the progress of civilization, not that of wealth, which nations must aim for in their action on each other.

When we seek to understand the causes that helped spread the benefits of social life among all men; the first, the most important, which we come across as antiquity is studied, is the foundation of colonies. The history of the colonization of countries situated on the coasts of the Mediterranean could just as easily be considered to be the history of human civilization. This, history, without being known to us in all its details, is sufficiently indicated by the historical monuments still existing; which reveal antiquity to us, so that we can get a sense of how it all came to be and still hangs together.

Almost at the beginning of historical time we find a powerful people, the Egyptians, who reached great wealth and great glory by events which still escapes our investigation. Her true story is wrapped up in the clouds, but the private lives of Egypt's inhabitants, their industry, their agriculture, their habits, their arts, have all become subject to our inspection. The image of it has been preserved by indestructible monuments, which very recently have been carefully deciphered. The 'civil' life of the Egyptians, their lives as members of the great 'settled community', of society, is represented in pictograms which makes its presence to our eyes. We see, without a shadow of a doubt, that in their agricultural arts they were well accomplished in their intention to subdue nature; the progress of which seems to us the most suitable to provide for a happy and large population, that was highly civilized about two thousand years before the Christian era.

The Egyptians have had no historians who have come down to inform us, they had no known philosophers who studied the progress of human societies; their action on their neighbors however, has been revealed to us. For the people who have given us the most admirable models in art of writing about history, the people who have best understood the art of what it is that constitutes human society, who have most successfully studied the interplay of interests, feelings, and passions; to wit, the Greeks, whose history begins precisely at the time when this immense picture of Egyptian civilization, recently put before our eyes, was composed. The Greeks tell us that at that time they themselves were complete barbarians, and that they owed all their progress, all their developments, to Egyptian colonies. The Greeks could have known only in the vaguest sense this figurative history of Egypt, that the art of engraving has reproduced in all our libraries, and which, until today, had been stolen from all eyes and put in sacred asylums from which

laymen were excluded. They did not try to put their own history in relation to the monuments of ancient Egypt; they mainly took care of themselves, and not of the paintings of Thebes accessed through a hundred gates. Although conceited, although seeking like all peoples to spread a halo of glory over their first origin, it is they who teach us that their ancestors did not come out of the wild at the time of the arrival on their shores of the Egyptian Inachus (around eighteen centuries BC). The Greeks, they say, as Pelasgians, had no fixed dwellings; by all the available evidence, they were hunters and herders. But their country, intersected by seaways and bordered by mountains, did not allow for the great pastoral life of Tartars or Scythians and Arabs, nor the formation of the great societies. They did not know all the animals that were domesticated in other places; the horse was brought to them by the sea, it was a present of Neptune; they weren't aware of horticulture, the plant kingdom provided them only with acorns and beech nuts, which they ate without having planted the trees that

produced them. The introduction of the three major cultures, the wheat by Ceres, the olive tree by Minerva, and the vine by Bacchus, indicates the progress was due to foreigners, though hidden under a mythological veil. None of these three were known in Greece at the time of Inachus; all the domestic arts were equally ignored, and men only put on the skins of animals they had eaten.

This social state of the Pelasgians was inferior to that of all of the peoples of Asia, of all the Negro inhabitants of Africa, who do practice the arts and agriculture; of all the pastoral peoples of these two parts of the world, to whom agriculture although inaccessible by the nature of their country, nevertheless rose quite high as civil societies. It was inferior even to the condition of the hunting peoples of America, who knew at least corn and potatoes, and who made some fabrics; and it cannot be compared other than with the state of the savages of Australasia. However, the Egyptian colonies brought the inhabitants of the country to the

105

highest level of civilization known at the time, they taught them all the arts of life, all the means to tame nature. They did not chase them around in any way, they did not exterminate them, but they admired the progress that these new societies made, they united with them in the cities they settled; they did not make new Egyptians, but formed Greeks. Religion, language, customs, the clothes, everything was Greek, everything belonged to the homeland, except not in the way it used to be. Above all though, the new political organization was Greek. Only there do we encounter the birth of freedom and love for country; there, the torch which was to illuminate the universe was lit.

About three hundred years in Greek history, from the arrival of Inachus who founded Argos, to that of Danaüs who was called to rule in the same city, are filled by the half-traditional, half-mythological stories of the arrival of all these chiefs, whether Egyptians or Phoenicians, who each in turn founded a new city, bringing with them new arts and new knowledge. Greece conveyed to posterity the names of those who taught it industrial subjects and human connectivity skills, like: agriculture, mining, fabric weaving, navigation, writing, currency, commerce, music making. Three hundred years passed, but at the end of this period the Greeks were more advanced than their Egyptian teachers; forming many separate states that engaged in continual struggles. They were less powerful without doubt than their teachers, they were less rich, their society was less stable, but they had more life in them, all the classes of their nation were closer, and mingled with each other more; generally, there was more happiness for all. No sooner had Greece assimilated the settlers arriving from Egypt with the natives, that it began to spread about on all the coasts of the Mediterranean in its turn the civilization it had just received. The colonies of the Ionians, Aeolians, Dorians, headed to Asia Minor. Others came to found new cities, in Italy, in Sicily, on the banks of the Pont-Euxin, on the coasts of Africa, and those of Provence.

Everywhere these colonies exercised on the natives the happy influence that the Egyptians had exerted on the Greeks. Everywhere they civilized, everywhere they taught the arts of life, everywhere they encouraged the former inhabitants to unite intimately with them, and everywhere, thanks to this union, they soon outstripped their home country, in population, in power, in wealth, in all the arts, and even in the developments of the mind. Troy, a Greek colony, was more powerful than any of the Greek cities that conspired to unite against it. The colonies of the Greeks in Asia Minor were richer, more advanced in the arts and in philosophy at the time of the Persian War, than the whole of the Peloponnese peninsula; so that their situation enabled them to oppose this powerful monarchy with a lesser force. The south of Italy took on the name of 'Magna Graecia', Greater Greece, because it in fact outweighed Ancient Greece by its land mass, number, wealth, and the power of its cities. Sicily was covered with still more prosperous cities; Syracuse not only surpassed Corinth that had founded it, but its population equaled that which is found throughout the whole island today; we have been assured that it had up to 1,200,000 inhabitants. Likewise Marseille surpassed in power, Phocée, which had founded that colony, and Cyrene on the island of Thera, from where the first colonists of Phocée had come.

Rome never was a colony of the Greeks, but Rome owed its civilization, its laws, its language, its religion, to the peoples of Italy, educated by the colonists of Greece. Rome was not satisfied, as the Greeks had been, to convey from country to country only its arts, its language, its religion and its philosophy; it set out to dominate wherever its weapons had penetrated first. The Greeks sowed on the shores of new and independent peoples; the Romans tended to homogenize. They also spread their colonies as far as they carried their weapons; but these colonies, although they formed a variety of great city images, were only the garrisons of the colonizers, not the seeds of new peoples. They too, however, were meant to mingle with the natives, to communicate to them all the progress in the

arts and social sciences that Rome had made, in its quest to civilization; and the Roman colonies did indeed complete the primary education of mankind, all over the old world.

One might have thought that a depiction of the progressive civilization of the modern world, by the colonies of Europeans, would not yield in size to that of colonization in antiquity. And indeed, in the last three centuries or so, Europeans did carry their colonies to almost all parts of the habitable globe. They subjected countries to colonization, which almost infinitely in extent surpassed those from which they came; and there they founded empires and republics whose proportions far exceed those of the old world. One does not make a comparison between colonies in modern times with those of the ancients however without first forming a mental picture, even before the reflection, warning us that the colonies of the

ancients renewed the people therein, reconditioning them to make them ready to begin a political existence with all the benefits of freshness and vitality; while the modern ones, on the contrary, are born old, with all the jealousy, all the anxiety, all the miseries, and all the vices, of old Europe; that the colonies of the ancients were constantly rising, in all aspects of civilization, above those who made them come alive; that ours, on the contrary, are constantly descending even below the civilization of their founders; that our colonies, already so large yet intended to grow much more, while one would seek in vain for virtues, patriotism, and strengths, which belonged to the world when it was young.

A closer look makes us sense even additional differences. The Greeks, and before them the Egyptians, founded a colony to make it a complete whole; we, instead, make it to become a part of an empire. They ceaselessly had the very good of the colonists in mind; to us, it's only the benefits to the motherland that counts. They wanted the new colony to be self-sufficient in terms of subsistence, defense, internal government, and in all principles of its development; we want it to be a completely dependent

108

entity, that subsists by commerce, and that this commerce enriches the motherland, be defended by the arms of the latter, obedient to its orders, governed by its lieutenants, and that the very education of these new citizens can be fulfilled only by their elder brothers.

A closer study of the colonies yet points out difference that are even more distressing. The colonies of Egyptians, Phoenicians, Greeks, and to some extent the Romans too, brought certain benefits to the countries where they settled; ours, can only be described as a calamity. The first, by their contact, civilized the barbarians; modern Europeans everywhere have set out to destroyed any civilization that was foreign to their own customs, in the midst of where they came to stay; they barbarized (that this expression be allowed) the peoples they called savages, by forcing them to renounce all the arts of life that they had invented on their own. The other side of the coin was that they barbarized themselves; because, here, we either saw the Europeans descend to customs of pastoral peoples; or there, to those of hunting peoples; but everywhere, in their interactions with the natives, their relationships where defiled by deceit, abuse of strength and cruelty; everywhere they have retreated in the industrial arts that they had brought with them from Europe; their agriculture became half-savage, all their implements were less refined; all their knowledge has remained more incomplete; the men of distinction were rarer there, and the general level of intelligence, just like of morality, descended instead of rising to a higher level.

Perhaps our views will be proven wrong by the successes of the United States, whose prosperity seems brilliant enough not look upon regret to the shortcomings of modern colonizations as compared to the ancient system. The United States, however, perhaps owes its principal advantages of their early founders aspiring much closer to the ideas and feelings of the Greeks and Romans, than we do today. The pilgrims of New England, emigrating

in search of freedom from oppression, proposed above all to create a new homeland as the Greeks used to do; all the subsequent settlers,

109

sent by Europe, carried with them, as their only principle, the love of the gain; the only theoretical extension of commerce; so they were always sacrificing the future for the present, and thus sowed germs of dissolution in the new colony from its birth. We will have too many opportunities to notice that these germs, one after the other and over time, developed into the USA.

Let us seek to better recognize the contrasts between the principles of the Greeks, when they founded a colony, and our modern ones.

The Greeks, by moving to a new region, wanted their colony to represent their original type of society, their community; founding colonies in the modern sense represents what we strive our society to be like: representing an empire. They focused their entire political existence on a single point; we disseminate ours over an entire territory. It is in no way an opportunity here for us to consider which is best for happiness, for the progress of intelligence, for virtue: the small republics of antiquity, or of our large monarchies. Each nation is driven, by circumstances which dominate the entire species, to seek strength or independence in a certain proportion of power with other nations; which, lacking this balance, might be tempted to abuse their power. But at the birth of new nations, and at the birth of new associations between nations, we have more freedom to benefit from the lessons of past experience. It's only to the settlers that we can say that for the mutual need to connect among themselves, so that a fraternity becomes established between adventurers, often gathered by chance alone, they must start by limiting their influence, they must project the appearance of being weak between strangers, for power would make them arrogant and threatening; in their position they must be benevolent to native peoples, striving to associate with them, instead of treating them as savages, and that they be especially careful not to introduce their advanced war-making prowess, that could be used for extermination purposes amongst the local peoples.

The first attention of the Egyptians, Phoenicians, later the Greeks and Romans, by founding a colony, was the

110

choice of the site where they would build their new city; because it was in cities that they wanted to live, it was by means of city living that they were able to disseminate the arts of city life, or really civilization itself (1). The site of the city had to be naturally strong enough so that its enclosure could easily be defended; and so that its inhabitants could, without the help of the motherland, resist sudden attacks from those whom they came to settle in the middle of. But this preparedness also assumed that the settlers could easily come together to take up arms, that the call of the bugle, just like responding to our alarm bells, would be enough to make them rush from

all parts of the territory they had been taking possession of. From this very circumstance alone flowed major changes throughout their economy. First of all their territory had to be very circumscribed. Most often it was only a desert that they had legitimately acquired from the local population, and in a peaceful manner; and this first contract was not, like those of modern colonists, endlessly re-interpreted, endlessly modified either by fraud or violence.

The ancient colonists felt well that they could not, that they should not leave their city, the only retreat they needed; they had no temptation to usurp a greater expanse of fields, and this greed, which nowadays puts Europeans forever in conflict with the natives, never entered their minds. The settlers, weak, few in number, and completely left to themselves (for the mother country did not dream of defending them), took care to build all their houses in the strict enclosure of the city. At nighttime they rested under a common guardianship, by day alone they could spread out in the fields for rural work. Under these circumstances their agriculture took on the character of that of Provence or like Spain, where there are no farm houses, no dwellings scattered in the fields, and where all farmers, with all their cattle, are locked up behind the village gates.

This agricultural system certainly has serious drawbacks;

(1) From *civitas*, (city), came the words *civic*, *civil*, *civilization*.

111

it multiplies the labors of the plowman and his cattle; it hardly allows him to study his field or its conduciveness to abundant harvests; it does not much encourage him to plant his fields with ornamentals to adorn them, to feel an affection for them.

But the influence of this system on humans is greater than the creation of wealth would be. For the feeling of social life, of civil life, is that of all sentiments that matters the most to be upheld among settlers; and rurally inhabited towns will remain much more civilized than if their inhabitants were scattered about in the fields. By itself, a society that founds a colony loosens the social bond. It's always the spirited, the most independent, the proudest, the most rebellious, who engage in this adventurous project. Often it's those who could not bear the yoke of laws in the mother country, despite their ancient authority and the power of habits. These same men are much less willing still to subject themselves to obedience in a brand new state, where no prejudice lends its support to order, where no habit has taken root. We must be careful not to allow them to disperse out into the deserts, because if they can establish their dwelling at a great distance from all their brethren, soon they will no longer recognize any other laws than their own whims, other judges than their resentments, their pride offended, or any other of their passions getting the better of them. Each father will be a little tyrant in his family; a stranger to the society of his peers, he will demand implicit obedience from his wife and children; the art of persuasion will be useless to him, the art of conversation presents neither an attraction nor a reward to him; he will not know any other

pleasures than those of his senses, and drunkenness will take a hold of him, suspending all further developments of the mind.

If by any chance a quarrel between him and one of his neighbors arises, he knows very well that no witness will see them, that no peacemaker will be able to come to his aid, that no investigation is possible; he will therefore seek to get rid of his adversary, or, if he is unarmed, tear his eyes out in the American way, putting an end to it, so as not to be tormented by his complaints, to not to be condemned by his testimony, supposing again

112

that he wants to submit to courts in the first place that cannot reach him or hold him responsible in any way. Whatever the culture of his spirit or the sweetness of his character, he will very quickly sink to the condition of the 'backwoodsman', the colonist of the remote forests, as is seen in America. To this lonely, brutal, and violent existence, which destroys all that is good in civilization, all sympathy for one's fellow men, but which retains all the qualities with which one can obtain a fortune, such as strength of body, skill, entrepreneurship, and above all: calculating outcomes and greed. But, in the Greek colony, man was constantly in the presence of man; he owed his fellow citizens, his companions in the adventure, an account of all his moments. He did not venture out into the distance without his absence being noticed, he could not indulge in any excess without his intoxication becoming objectionable, his outbursts, his acts of tyranny were known to all, and subjecting him to public animadversion; and finally, he could not commit a homicide, and flatter himself of evading the laws, whether one of his compatriots or a native was his victim. True enough, the colony was missing the force to push him out of the colonial territory, but he himself had such a constant need of its government, that he kept coming back to put himself under its wing. This government however, knowing its own weaknesses and in need of the offender's local neighbors, considered a quarrel with the natives as a public offense. If the offender made up his mind not to return to his home in the evening, to escape the courts of his new homeland, it was necessary that he would disappear forever; and an eternal exile, among the colony's elders, was regarded as the ultimate torture under their control.

In modern colonies, an immense expanse of fertile land seems abandoned to the first occupant, and the colonist, relying on the almighty protection of the mother country, ascribes himself a part which is not in proportion either with his own physical strength to work it, or with his capital to improve on it; nor is it commensurate with his needs to consume the yield. The settler of antiquity, who did not only count

113

on himself but also on his companions in the adventure, did not even want to own fields from which he could not hear the warlike bugle that would call on him to defend his settlement; and it was on this principle, that the colonial authority based its decision on regarding the division of lands it

had acquired. Everyone had to have a more or less equal share, since everyone had to be always within reach of the stockade; the divisions spread like the sections of a circle, the to be cultivated fields being the closest to the fortified enclosure; beyond that the colony still had a pasture area, where one could see from afar any approaching enemy. So whatever the initial wealth discrepancy between the settlers might have been; the common interest and security of all, brought the territorial division back to an equality between them all. No one asked each head of the family to buy his new land, for the distribution was free; at most it proportioned itself to the strength of each family to cultivate the land and to defend it; and as to their needs to consume the fruits of them. Also, upon their arrival, the colonists, limited by space, were forced to introduce into their fields that type of culture which would draw the highest value from their land; they thus applied all the practices of the most advanced rural science of their motherland, and this is how they taught their art to the local inhabitants. Our colonists, on the contrary, learn theirs from them.

Suddenly masters of the huge amount of land they're now holding, either by the right of conquest, or by having made a purchase from the native community, they don't go about sparing any of the blessings of nature. They thin the forests by fire, or by debarking trees, letting them rot in place; They relinquish any system of fertilization, complemental planting, crop rotation; they attach themselves to a few naturally privileged areas on the soil, to which they sacrifice all the others; they exhaust these with a succession of nutrient depleting harvests, soon reducing the richest sites to sterility. All the vast and beautiful countrysides bordering the Atlantic, whose fertility astonished Europeans when they landed there for the first time, were ruined in this way by the greed of the farmer, who sacrificed the future for the present.

The colonist, instructed by the American way in the art of destroying, does not even dream of imitating him in the art of preserving. The same fault has been repeated too at the Cape of Good Hope, in New Holland, in van Diemen's Land; it is by four hundred and by eight hundred acres apiece that we distribute the land in these new settlements. We want to start with farms as extensive as those that rich English gentleman farmers submit to the cultivation that demands the most advance capital, and yet these are given to men almost without any capital at all. The system of cultivation however, will undoubtedly follow the one of earlier colonists, carried out on the banks of the Atlantic; that is to say, all from the perspective of the present, and without any forethought given to the future. Likewise, in the colonization projects for Algeria, we only heard about large shareholder companies and large farms; while it was necessary to especially think hard about the customs and habits of the Arab farmer, the ways and means of coordinating those with European methods, and of returning to him this profitable association of ideas from both sides, with the improvements to be made benefiting the agricultural industry of the country, and not being the cause of its upheaval. If indeed the lands conquered in Africa are taken

from the native farmers, natives to be handed over to French speculators, to people in a hurry to enjoy, in a hurry to destroy, and incapable to create anything, agriculture, far from advancing, will instead retreat from the point where the Arabs are carrying it out right now.

The Greek colonies were made up of men whose status was free, but yet drawn from all ranks of society, and they were led, in heroic times, by the sons of kings, later by Eupatridae, or citizens of the most illustrious birth; however the unavoidable consequence of their enterprises was establishing an equality between the colonists of the highest order. Those families who embarked on these adventurous expeditions did not take a fortune to speak of with them and they did not think of making their fortune in the colonies either. It is not that they gave up ambition; they flattered themselves that they stood out in distinction among their fellow citizens, in councils or in war. They flattered themselves that they would become distinguished by their eloquence, their prudence, or their valor, but never that they would become rich.

115

On the soil of their new homeland they could only rely on the work of their hands to live; they received, like all the others, their share in the yield of the colonial fields; they had to cultivate them without servants, without day laborers, without slaves: because the new society, surrounded as it was by enemies or jealousy, did not permit to also gather in its bosom enemies, of the domestic kind. Among the small peoples of antiquity, at the time of their mutual independence, slavery was still only an accident of the law of war, and not an industrially organized operation; this also being the reason why work hadn't been dishonored yet. The colony's citizens of the highest rank therefore did not refuse manual labor; but it was necessary that this work did not entirely fill up their time, because their new homeland owed much for its administration, instruction and defense. In a country however, where the plowman has no rent to pay, where the State has no debts, where a share in the product of labor of the yet to be born generations has not been mortgaged, or sold in advance by their fathers to their creditors, in a country where the customs are simple, and where luxury is unknown at the same time, rural industry provides more than an adequate sustenance of those who exercise it. If today the plowman can live on half of his crops, yielding the other half to his master; a colonial owner plowman, living off his work, could devote the other half of his time to the public service of the colony.

Thus the rich of the mother country had ceased to be rich in the colony; but the poor, on their side, had ceased to be poor. Both of them lived off the work of their hands, but off work which was liberally rewarded by nature. Both were called to habitually exercise all their bodily faculties, but they none the less also habitually exercised all the faculties of mind. The government of a colony functioned more as a democracy than that of any former State or motherland; it had to, but it could do so without any danger. The various conditions of the citizens, among these small peoples,

did not act like they were still in their home country; nor like they do in modern colonies, by a universal rivalry of one against the other.

116

But on the contrary, all felt a common interest, which always related to the native population. Trade with them alone was to feed the new colony in its beginnings; the ways to win their friendship, to gain their trust, to establish between them and the colonists common identifying marks and a language of convention was in everyone's urgent interest. At the same time, it was from the native population that all the dangers could come; vigilance over them; and, in the event of a sudden quarrel, defensive action against them, were also interests that all colonists felt equally. When they had left their motherland, a few sons of illustrious or of wealthy men, had probably taken with them some, pride of birth or of family, some feeling of their superiority; and if this superiority united with a more careful education, habits, and experience of the world, the traditions of their fathers and their known talents; this was recognized and appreciated throughout the colony, because it was useful to all. It even flattered the popular imagination, for it is in a country where everything is new, where everything is yet emerging; where the memories of what once was, become the most dear. Yet the least colonist, the least cultivator, had an identical purpose to the one of his 'eupatridae'. Like him he served the country by his vigilance, and he defended it with his arms; like him he was admitted to councils where the nascent people deliberated on the existence of all. The narrower the circle, the more intimate the trust, the more the common man absorbed from the well-born man with whom he was now associated, the mighty education of circumstances and common action. Nowadays we have been accustomed to confuse instruction with the influence of books; while great instruction, truly fruitful instruction is the practical action man that shows by example to other man. All community interests were in turn debated in the 'Agora', all the examples were put before the eyes of everyone, and all social characters were developing in some way in public, and the study of man, the philosophical study of

117

passions and human interests was accessible to the poorest as well as to the richest. The delicacies of language did not limit the impacts, for all studied to speak it with the same purity. Now and then a few new books increased the assembled common instruction, their effect was popular: it was to a gathering of Greeks that Herodotus had read his history. We like to claim nowadays to democratic ideals also; but we are lacking the first element of Greek cities: the equality of condition which was the result of their economic organization, an equality which was nowhere greater than in the nascent colonies.

Communal interests, intimate and during rapprochement of all citizens, and their constant action on one another, made the colonies of antiquity function as a school of mutual education. The knowledge that a few

superior men had brought there, soon spread throughout the mass of the small nation, by a continual contact, by exchanges of all observations, of all thoughts, on an almost daily basis. What only one knew, soon all knew, all practiced it, and all taught it to the native inhabitants. This is how the cultivation of wheat, olive trees, grape vines, the industry of metalwork, that of weaving, the knowledge of the alphabet and the art of writing, currency, arithmetic, music, and more, were successively introduced into new countries, and that a tradition or mythology preserved the traces of these great benefits; each was assigned to a single heroic figure, to a single semi-fabulous being, but all his unknown companions became with him the teachers of nations, because the talent, the superiority, the benevolence of each leader, was reflected by all members of the nascent society that were associated with him.

How the actions of our modern colonies form a distressing contrast with that of these ancient colonies, who took it upon themselves to become the civilizers of mankind! Modern settlers from the shores of any one mother country, do not form a chosen society, commonly associating to accept the same chances, and uniting under the faith of always being ready to expose themselves, each for all, all for any single one.

118

There is neither fraternity nor trust between them, nor can there be any. The settlers, for the most part, are men who have experienced the world, likely in the form of setbacks, all to a greater or lesser sorrow. They leave Europe with a ruined fortune, a credit shaken by the misfortunes that we have no doubt to attribute to a certain recklessness; they will seek a new world, where they can forget the old one, and where they themselves can remain unknown. These, for the most part, are still restless minds, bitter in their push back on what formed their lot in the old world; and who, as a result, could not be satisfied with the place which is reserved for them. They are also avid adventurers of fortune, who, not wishing to trust the ordinary chances of industry and agriculture, deal with their destiny like a game of chance, and expose their lives and fortune to hazards which, since they are unknown, seem immense to them. This mixed bunch, already so untrustworthy, is still expanded more by the outright rejects of the old society, who are dismissed with disgust onto the new. These undesirables, whom their families want to spare themselves the ignominy of judicial proceedings, obtain as favor a pass to the colonies. The garrisons sent there are made up of 'disciplinary' regiments, aside from the above recruited from the type of soldiers whose follies, vices, and sometimes crimes, caused other regiments to repel them. Finance employees, judicial officers, magistrates, the governor himself, are most often sent to the colonies as it were in an honorable exile. The most prominent have been dismissed from court, because their credit was lost; others from the legislative chambers, because their opposition was feared there. A few have been removed from the public eye, to which they began to become obnoxious; others were sent off to prevent investigations that might have become embarrassing to powerful others; but in the end, all were chosen

not as being the most suitable for a life in the colony, but as being found too unsuitable to stay in their old country. And finally, in this distressing enumeration of so many elements of disorder, vices, and crimes, we have yet to include the class that Europe could not add to its colonial prospects

119

without committing a cruel offense to humanity, the deportees, these men scarred by infamous judgments, and who are sent to inoculate their crimes in a new nation, which is designated by a name which makes one shudder, a “penal colony”.

Is it strange that men who are pointed out as belonging to most suspect classes, although in varying degrees, instead of seeking each other out, they avoid each other; that as soon as they arrive on the vast continent open to conduct their businesses, disperse over its entire extent? Those who feel in their hearts the love of honor and of duty know well that their contact with their companions in adventure might well defile them, can at least compromise them, but will not teach them anything good. Those who have to make people forget their past avoid the eyes of men; those who feel that their present conduct would not stand up to an examination either, avoid them even more. All the beneficent influences of human society is therefore lost for all of them; the corrupting influence remains however, for no colonists live absolutely alone. The richest among them, the most civilized, are obliged to associate themselves with their inferiors for the day to day operations of their establishments, and they borrow always something of their language, of their rudeness and their vices. Even in penal colonies, regardless of the reluctance of the guards to approach the condemned, as they do almost all the work that needs doing, they have to deal with them; so that for a best outcome, they better show them some confidence, and value them according to their greater or lesser hardening in criminal behavior, and often they look almost like an honest man, the one who only has been seduced once or twice. The corrupting effect of the presence of habitual corrupt beings is inevitable; the poison also spreads onto those who hate them and onto those who make excuses for them. The man who would see in these condemned, with which he can't help but be constantly surrounded, only objects of disgust or aversion, who would lose all sympathy for the human figure, all pity for observed pain, all faith in an expression of feelings, would have experienced a moral contagion

120

even more unwelcome than the one who would have become accustomed to deal leniently with vice or crime as a matter of course. So here we have these degraded beings, who can only be born in the mire of big cities, who have lost all moral feeling, and who do no longer distinguish the just and the honest, introduce themselves to positions where they are conducting a hotbed of corruption that will thrive as long as they live. Centuries may not suffocate these evil germs of vice, which barbarically have become integrated with our institutions, that are destined to grow rapidly as well.

It was not only the penal colonies that transplanted the crimes and vices of countries that have passed through civilization to virgin lands. The history of the modern European colonies also shows us civilized man everywhere abusing the superiority of its forces and its influence to cheat the natives, to force them to war, to corrupt and even to exterminate them. The Greeks, through their colonies all over the coast of the Mediterranean, settled a wandering people everywhere; they introduced first agriculture, then the arts, followed with commerce, to hunting and pastoral peoples; they taught them the science of governance and the love of freedom; they substituted these for a dark and bloody cult, for the jealous and oppressive power of priesthoods, to become the cult of the hero benefactors of humanity, who personified were the gods of Greece; and they finally opened minds to a new philosophy, which would later reform and purify a further reforming religion. By conveying all these benefits, the Greeks ascertained that the population would increase; which, to our understanding, was a happy population. The 'Magna Graecia', Sicily, and Asia Minor, had thousands of cities, to which the provincial towns of our greatest empires could not be held up in comparison. The population of the original inhabitants, enriched by the arts of Greece, was increasing at the same time with a speed no less surprising, and civilization spread to areas where the great

121

civilizers had never put their steps. Nowadays, on the contrary, wherever Europeans have settled, they have destroyed the pre-existing civilization. We have seen them disappear upon contact, first all the higher ranks in a native society, then all the perfected arts and agriculture that earlier had been practiced by the natives of the country, then all the native virtues, and finally the race itself. It is a fact today which admits of no doubt, and that we are presented with even as a law of nature, that wherever the white race comes into contact with an indigenous race, the latter must disappear in the course of few generations by necessity.

When the Spaniards landed on the coasts of the New World, they found them almost equally divided between peoples who were still barbarous, and peoples who had already made great progress in civilization. The most advanced of these were the inhabitants of the Antilles and those of the two great empires of Mexico and Peru. These showed what development the red race, which inhabits all the Americas, was likely to acquire by itself, and without foreign assistance. The peoples, once wandering, had been settled for a long time. They had not found in the New World that very rare species of animals capable of being tamed; and so they had not tried to adapt themselves to a pastoral life. But they had been more successful in extending their domination over the vegetable kingdom; they had obtained a very abundant subsistence by means of agriculture; indeed a large and happy population covered and fertilized the countryside, at the same time as a class dedicated to the arts it built great cities. Between the tropics, a much less extensive area is required to provide sufficient food for human beings, with much less labor, than in temperate regions. In the 'hot lands of the seashore', as well as on the islands, a banana plantation, a 'platanar'

which occupies only one hundred square meters, gives more than four thousand pounds per year of nourishing substance, while the same

122

space would barely give thirty pounds of wheat in France. And while it is true that a cassava plantation, from which cassava meal is extracted, requires more work and more time, it provides a substance as abundant and even more nourishing than the banana. The culture of the productions of the tropics was practiced intelligently on the islands; it maintained a prodigiously large population there, which, with few needs and a lot of leisure, spent its lives in celebrations and joy. The population of Mexico and Peru, especially in the 'tierras templadas', and the 'tierras frias' (the temperate and cold mountainous lands), needed more constant work, either to subdue nature, or to support the political and religious luxuries of these two empires. Here, corn and potato formed the basis of the food of the people; but at the same time an infinite variety of fruits and flowers greatly increased the pleasures of the people. The floating gardens, which were established on lakes in Mexico, displayed, as they still do, all the ostentation of this rich vegetation. Plantations of the Maquay cactus (*Agave americana*), from which 'pulque' or wine from Mexico is drawn, is replacing our vines. Manufactures, adapted to the needs of the people, had multiplied in the cities, a court that loved brilliance, great people, proud of their wealth, and a religion that surrounded itself with ceremony, had been directing industry towards the pleasures of luxury. In Peru, a beautifully designed irrigation system, executed with as much art as magnificence, spread the fertility over a vast country, between the Andes and the sea, which nowadays is relentlessly scorched by the sun, since the Spanish conquistadors destroyed the watering canals of the Incas. The red race, both in Mexico and Peru, had wanted to perpetuate the memory of its deeds and discoveries, and had invented a hieroglyphic script for this. It had also discovered the art of mining and worked a few metals, and to its misfortune adorned itself with gold and silver ornaments which aroused the greed of the first Spanish settlers.

123

We have no intention of retracing the appalling conduct of these Spaniards in the New World here; public opinion has already branded that forever. Suffice it to say that if we consider both the number of their victims and the duration of the torments which they inflicted on them, their crimes exceed all the crimes which soiled the history of the human race. In the intoxication of victory, a few Tartar conquerors gave the terrible order to slaughter all the inhabitants of a city, of a province even, to raise hideous pyramids with their heads in memory of their victory; but the greedy Spanish ferocity cost much more more lives to humanity; it devoured them by a much more atrocious, much more prolonged torture; it sacrificed them without provocation, and in the calm of a rapacious calculation. The peaceful inhabitants of these lands were all condemned to work in the

mines also; they were forced to perform tasks that exceeded their strength, while allocated insufficient food; they were driven there by the whip of their inspectors, despite debilities, their wounds, diseases, and finding no relief in this horrible torment other than in death, which was not long in coming. Depopulation came about with such an unusual rapidity, that in the course of a single generation the red race disappeared from the West Indies in its entirety; the population of Saint-Dominique alone was made up of over a million inhabitants; Cuba, much larger, held at least as many, and all the other islands in proportion to size.

Among the Caribs, a few thousand men of this unfortunate race escaped extermination; but it was only these who, embittered by suffering and having lost all hope, no longer kept fixed dwellings; they abandoned agriculture, gave up their civilization, and threw themselves into living savagely. The oppression that the people of Mexico and Peru had been subjected to was less dreadful; but either the inhabitants of the mountains were more vigorous, or perhaps more accustomed to hard work, or that the slavery which was imposed on him, the 'mita', which called him in turn to mines, was exercised with a little more fairness before the eyes

124

of the nearby viceroy, or finally that there was not enough time left to accomplish the work of total annihilation destruction; as part of the elder inhabitants survived the most atrocious measures, and it is they who are renewing this part of the population today.

At the time of Mr. von Humboldt's voyage, they were no longer subjected to any kind of slavery, their work in the mines was voluntary and very well paid; and at the same time they had resumed with ardor the pursuit of agriculture. In Mexico, the red men, who form a population of 3,676,000 souls still, are the only ones who identify themselves by their industry in the cultivation of land, and in their activity for introduce it to new districts. But this population henceforth isn't made up of more than laborers; of the former Aztec Empire all the higher ranking ones, that is to say: all the rich, all priests, all scholars, all bourgeois, all the merchants have disappeared. One can no longer find any of them in the civilization of the red race. These ploughmen are attached to the aftermath of a Spanish and Christian civilization which isn't theirs; none of their own ideas prepare them for profit taking, no progress is possible for them, no European developmental ideas reaches them. In Peru, the red race has suffered more, it is nearer to extinction, and nothing remains of the ancient civilization of the Incas; but negroes and mulattoes have been replacing it and are charged with doing the most heavy work. In Chile, where the natives were distinguished by warlike attributes more than by civilization, they have been pushed entirely out of European society; but the savage peoples there are charged up by the Spaniards in continual wars against each other, and drunkenness made them lose all the qualities that once distinguished them.

One can only hope that the Europeans and Christians never will recall the conduct of the Spaniards in the New World without horror and without indignation. With some reason, no doubt, they will blame the spirit of the

sixteenth century. The old Spanish marauding bands led by Ferdinand the Catholic, Charles V, and Philip II, stood out during this century in Italy, in

125

France, Germany, and in the Netherlands, by their ferocity, and one should not be surprised if that same character raised its ugly head even more so in the New World, where these fierce warriors were completely removed from the brakes of public opinion, while at the same time they didn't have the slightest feeling of brotherhood for men of another race.

But, without pretending to excuse the Spaniards, it is above all the modern system of colonization that we must condemn for the committing of such horrors. It is this system that was pushed onto foreign lands by adventurers without honor, without probity, without brakes; it is what encourages their greed, that celebrates their robberies as exploits; and that lets abandon to all its most shameful passions, men of another race; beginning by naming them barbarians, next allows them to be stripped bare, and ending up with dispensing off them without pity; whereby giving the aggressors all the support of civilization, all the support of a powerful nation being advanced in the arts of war, their supply of weapons, ammunition, and, when the time comes, its soldiers to exterminate harmless natives. By continuing the review of modern colonies, it will soon be recognized that the arrival of settlers from all other nation in Europe was not any less fatal to the natives than that of the Spaniards. Furthermore, that the Spaniards were the only ones who admitted the natives in their social union, to at least occupy the lower ranks of it. They are the only ones in the Americas where the red race recovered and is starting to grow again; everywhere else it is on the point of extinction.

It was, moreover, only in the old Spanish colonies, Mexico, Peru, and the Philippines, that the all-consuming activity of an adventurer lifestyle gave way to more sedentary habits, that spurred its inhabitants into thoughts of enjoying life, instead of having as only aim to get rich quickly. Only there has the universal competition to win, to accumulate, by means of honest or dishonest means, at least moderately been suspended; and there also have the subjugated races obtained, if not equal rights, then at least respect and some protection. In Cuba, the Spanish settlers continue to exploit men

126

in preference to things; they are manufacturers, they abandon themselves to the mercantile spirit in all its harshness; they grow cane, and they refine sugar in true accordance with the economic system of the chrematistic school, aiming only to increase products, and save as much as possible on the cost of these; that is to say, on the maintenance of men that brings it about. Also, of all the slave countries, there are none where their treatment is more barbaric than in Havana, none where the slave trade is exercised more openly. In all the rest of the half-barren possessions of the Spaniards, in New Mexico, California, the Andes, Paraguay, the countries watered by the Amazon, wherever careers were opened up to adventurers, the mixed-

breed population fully acts in the old spirit of the settlers, and their action to barbarizing the country is as constant, as cruel, as it has ever been. All the neighboring peoples have been sacrificed to them like game in the forests and savannahs, just so that they can make their profits, whether it's alive or in death. They go hunting 'Indios bravos' (savage Indians), with just as few scruples as they would go on a hunt of wild boars.

If they can lure them into traps, their preferred method, they force them into their nets with hounds. If they surround their villages, they slaughter everything that resists, and they drag the rest into slavery. By having to undergo continual pursuits, they forced these Indians into wandering lives, only living off hunting; and as soon as the Spaniards capture these Indians, they oblige them to a constant work, beyond their strength, under which they are not long in perishing.

It's true enough that alongside these odious hunters of men, as described above, colonies of missionaries went into the wilderness to follow these same 'Indios bravos', and strove to convert them to the Christian religion at the same time as to resettle them into agricultural life. God forbid that we refuse to express our admiration for such a high virtue, such ardent charity, for such great self-sacrifice. However, missions never have had the same beneficent effects that the ancient colonies had; not that the Indians were inferior to the Pelasgians, and more incapable

127

of being educated, but because the instruction given to them by 'Padres' was too unprepared, too unrelated to their nature. They set out to educate them not by their situation in the material world, but as it related to the invisible world; they wanted to lead them, not to understand, but to accept these mysteries on human and divine nature, that even the strongest minds, among the most meditative nations, have difficulty in grasping; and, while forcing them to give up their own language, they exposed these mysteries in two new languages, Castilian and Latin, which then brought to the poor Indians nothing but empty sounds without meaning. It is because of this sacrifice of intelligence to memorization that the 'Indios reducidos' (the submissive Indians) became grown-up children, under these missionaries; of listening without understanding, and obeying without knowing why. Besides, almost all the pleasures have been represented to them like sins, so that they live without a motive for living; they have lost all their inner drive, they present the image of a European society, stripped of its activity, of its intelligence; they are incapable of progress, and they confirm, by the very effect that a European education has had on them, the same prejudice that the European race has adopted toward the whole red race. Moreover, the 'Indios reducidos' find it difficult to escape from the vexations of the Spaniards, who themselves only jealously regard the companies of Padres for their conversions. Each missionary progress subtracts a certain number of individuals or families from his fund of human creatures, which the colonists regard as reserved for their right to hunt; impoverishing the slave market, and, the faster the captives die, the more they consider it important to maintain the stock from which they capture them. Missionaries as a rule

had settled at a great distance from these aggressive settlers; but, as these are constantly advancing, the missions are soon found to be in contact with the hunters of 'Indios bravos', who, from their side, take as a pretext for their hostilities the desire to make conversions among them.

The Spanish government,

128

full of prejudices as it was, however oppressive it often showed itself for the interests of the colony, at least had no sympathy with the man-hunters, and its general orders were most often aimed at protecting humanity and religion. But in the new republics, the local authorities have been entrusted to men who share the passions of those in the district which elected them. In general, they have shown themselves to be very unfavorable toward the missions; sometimes forcing the 'Padres' themselves, along with all the the 'Indios reducidos' to emigrate. Numerous bands were seen arriving in English Guiana, while Mr. Poeppig, crossing upper Peru in 1832, found, at the center of the old missions of Cuchero, Pampayaco and Tocache, only silent deserts; the rapid vegetation of the tropics no longer allowed any trace of the still recent work of man to be recognized there. The republics, in expelling the missionaries, claimed praise for their liberalism; they wanted, or so they say, to contain the formidable influence of the clergy, and oppose the progress of superstition; not many people will understand, a few thousand leagues away, that the real goal of this liberalism was to extend the hunting of men to include new districts.

The white race, true enough, by exterminating the red race in much of the Americas, greatly increased in its place. Nowadays the whole continent of South America is open to Europeans, especially so to Spanish descendants. But one must in no way believe that with their race, civilization has also been spreading in these deserts. The large plateau of South America has covered itself with herds of oxen and horses brought there from Europe. In New Granada, the republics of Rio de la Plata, Bolivia, Chile, one could meet a lot of owners who own fifteen and twenty thousand horned beasts; but the 'Vaquero', who lives in the midst of these herds that have become wild again; and all the population of these central regions, or those called the 'Llaneros', have come down rather to the level of hunting peoples, than up to

129

the herding peoples of the old world. Far from taming or domesticating wild animals, as the Tartars or the Arabs had done, they have returned domestic animals to the wild, which they then can only benefit from by destroying them. An Arab, by his care, his intelligence, his affection, in the study of all animal instincts, had succeeded in bonding with and in making obedient, the proudest and the fiercest; the 'Llanero' considers the ox, the sheep, the goat, the swine, like wild game that gives him the pleasure of hunting, and whom he delights inflicting torments to with an unspeakable ferocity.

What we have said about the Spanish colonies may, in many ways, apply to the Portuguese colonies as well. These, instead of carrying civilization, have also spread robbery and desolation everywhere. In Brazil, where the Portuguese found themselves in contact with the red race, being in its first state of barbarism, that is to say when it is made up of wandering hunters who are just beginning to clear and cultivate their lands, forced it to give up this culture, and to go deep into the woods, where the colonists pursue it either to exterminate it or reduce it to slavery. They have been seeking to replace it by negroes, of which still today they import a hundred thousand each year in Brazil; whenever the moment approaches when these become the most formidable, they will slaughter them all. In the two kingdoms of Congo and Mozambique, where the Portuguese settled on both the west and east coasts of Africa, settlers, of European blood or mixed, have come down so close to the level of the natives, that one can distinguish them no longer; any trace of civilization has disappeared from among them, and the sovereignty of Portugal, over such a vast portion of Africa, in modern times, has been noticed only by the insistence of the Portuguese nation to continue the slave trade, when it is being disapproved of by the rest of Europe; because, so said the Portuguese diplomats, their merchants had an exclusive right to sell the inhabitants of these regions, since they were born subjects to the King of Portugal.

130

The Portuguese expeditions to the East Indies reminds one of those of the Spaniards to Mexico and Peru; we find there the same mixture of greed and chivalrous bravery, the same religious fanaticism combined with perfidy and ferocity. But the Portuguese arrived in nations more civilized, richer, and above all more advanced in the art of war, than those that were conquered by the Spaniards. They needed to be more cautious with them; so they presented themselves more often as merchants than as warriors; all the more, there were no mines in the places where they sought to establish themselves, so that they could not have developed the dreadful thought of bringing down entire generations of conquered peoples into the bowels of the earth, to extract gold or silver. However, by sticking only to reading Portuguese historians, we remain convinced that in any of their quarrels with the Indians, it was always the Portuguese who were wrong, so that the reproach of being the aggressors, the perfidious, and the barbarians, must always fall on them; that their wars cost humanity torrents of blood which they shed with gaiety of heart; and that their domination over India, fortunately reduced today to two big cities only, has done a lot to roll this country back towards a state of anarchy and military oppression, towards this domination of adventurers substituting for that of the governments in earlier times, which therefore is almost constantly distressing the country. The Dutch colonies were founded on the ruins of the Portuguese Empire in the Indies. The system changed, a wholly mercantile spirit replaced the religious and chivalrous spirit; which shed a sort of glare on Portuguese greed and ferocity, but humanity gained nothing by the change. The Dutch did not think any more than the Spaniards or the Portuguese of bringing

civilization to the native population. Whether Republicans and Protestants, and regardless of having realized in them all the advantages of the spirit of examination, conclusion, and cooperation from all for the good of all, although having achieved their own freedom and independence through a federation of

131

provinces and cities, each of which caring for their local interests with predilection; they offered no freedom, no progress of understanding, no thoughts toward advantages to the native population, in their conquests. They stood at an immense distance from the beneficent colonization of the Greek; and, wherever their dominion extended, they did not even think to disguise the miserly and cold calculations of self-interested speculators, who brought everything they needed only for their benefit, whose only esteem lied in money, and who did not even wonder if the regulations by which they protected their monopoly, the misery, desolation and mortality among the natives, whom without provocation, without pretext, they had reduced to subjection by the force of their weapons.

Nothing has made it clearer to the world, that the base greed displayed by the Dutch mercantilists is incendiary; as in the Moluccas, where its spice plantations were actually set on fire rather than allow their prices to fall on the market in Europe. We also know all about their annual expeditions in the Sunda islands, uprooting all the cinnamon, cloves, pepper, and nutmeg trees, which could have escaped their monopoly. But it is above all in the life of Sir Stamford Raffles, of that virtuous administrator, who succeeded the Dutch, first in Java, later in Bencoolen, and who then had the temerity of handing over to the Dutch, this same island of Java on which he had spread so many benefits, that one can learn all one needs to know that this miserly and immoral government still allows itself today to push back its industrious subjects in the Indies towards barbarism; what scourge, for the whole magnificent archipelago of the Sunda Islands, the domination of the Dutch is, and how guilty the minister was who, lightly, foolishly, by the Treaty of Vienna, made millions of well at ease individuals subjects to the hated masters who oppress them so cruelly.

The Dutch government, which has rolled back towards barbarism all its possessions in the Indian Ocean, will perhaps appear, at first glance, to have been more successful

132

in the great colony of the Cape of Good Hope, that it founded in 1652 with a handful of Europeans, and that at the time meant a more than substantial extension to their empire; but which was seized by the English in 1795, who have possessed it since then.

It was not until 1670 that the Dutch bribed Hottentots, among whom they found themselves established, in the district of Cape Town, and afterwards settling Dutch peasants, called 'Boers', there, to cultivate and offer for sale fresh provisions to the vessels which docked at Cape Town, in the crossing

between Europe and India; and one could hardly have expected that these 'Boers', peaceful and industrious farmers of the 'polders' of Holland, and renowned for their methodical habits and their slowness, would transform themselves in a single generation into a pastoral, warmongering people, no less quarrelsome no less formidable to its neighbors than the Mongols and the Tartars. But the Boers had in front of them, vast regions suitable above all for grazing and that the natives of the country had already covered with flocks; behind them they had a seaport, which offered them a rich market for all their products of the pastoral industry. They were in contact with peoples for whom no sympathy had ever been expressed by anyone, which they were left to exploit, and on which their own fire power assured them an incontestable superiority. Finally, in all their quarrels with them, they were assured of the powerful aid of the Cape government; which would, in normal circumstances, neither inspect them, nor direct them; and, while renouncing the pretension to judge them, also always believed obliged to defend them. The Dutch Boers could only abuse such advantages. The land where the Dutch had founded their colony was inhabited by a gentle and inoffensive race, men divided into small tribes, and incapable of putting up an effective resistance. They were the Hottentots, whom we liked to point out to Europe only for their ugliness, their dirt and their superstitions; however these men had made the first and most important steps in civilization, those that have been making everyone else in the world at ease: they were surrounded

133

by domestic animals, and they cultivated the land. Man already exercises a great deal of intelligence when he studies and knows how to recognize, in the wild animal, those qualities that can be made use of in a domestication of them, and the affections by which one can earn their obedience; when he unraveled, in the plants of the forest, the properties useful to man and the means to propagate them. The Pelasgians were not so far advanced, when the Egyptians and the Phoenicians landed among them; the Italians, the Gauls had hardly taken these first steps, when the Greeks inspired them take all the next ones. With benevolence, persuasion, and good faith, settlers would have led the Hottentots onto the paths of civilization. Already then their population was very considerable, and by today they would have become a powerful nation; But the Boers did not believe themselves to be bound to them by any of the duties concerning morality; under the pretext of doing business with them, they deceived them in their trades, and after having agitated their resentment through fraud, they then used this very resentment as a pretext for making war on them. Associating in groups of 80 to 100 local militias, they threw themselves on the nearest tribe, killing those who defended themselves, and subjugating others to slavery; to those who had fled, they stole their cows, which made up their only wealth, and so exposed them to starvation. The Hottentot population, during the time of the first European settlement, could not be estimated at less than 200,000 souls; as of today we only count about 20,000, and yet three quarters of those are the sons of Europeans, that their

fathers left in the care of their black mothers who had given birth to them. From the year 1771 onward, the Dutch were the sole masters of the whole country, all the way up to the snowy mountains (Sneeuw Berghen); they owned an area of 100,000 square miles in extent, or ten times the area of the "United Provinces" in their mother country; but the human race had almost disappeared from this vast territory.

After the extermination of the Hottentots, and the subsequent occupation of their lands, the Dutch settlers found themselves in contact with a more bellicose, more united and more formidable people

134

that they designated by the name of 'Kaffers', from the Arabic kafir, or disbeliever, but this name is unknown to them. The Boers attacked them in the same way, but they first had to gather greater forces to do this, and to summon for help from the national militias, which are indicated by the name of a 'Commando'. "It seems to us," says a writer for the *Edinburgh Review* (1), "that the Boers were only conquerors of the south of Africa. The government of Cape Town, and that of Holland had done what they could to contain them, by their threats and their proclamations, and to protect the natives who owned the land against their attacks; everything was in vain however. The Boers marched forward with their herds, which were constantly increasing; wherever they found pasture, they seized the country, and the colonial government had no other course to take than to follow them, to claim the sovereignty of their conquests."

The passage of the colony under English domination was able to change this system somewhat; but, in spite of themselves, the English have been dragged by their Dutch subjects into always more extensive conquests, to increasingly bitter wars, and to the expulsion or destruction of all natives. The last war against the 'Kaffers', which the treaty of September 17, 1835, ended, was signaled by ferocious acts which drew severe disapproval on the part of European soldiers from the British government. It extended the colony's border to the banks of the Ky and Keiskamma rivers, covering an area of at least 200,000 square miles; but Europeans do not count for more than about one hundred and thirty thousand inhabitants of their own race, in this immense empire; the many nations that once inhabited it have been destroyed, and the small number of free blacks that the last treaty has been intermingling with the Europeans, will soon disappear.

The history of the Cape of Good Hope colony changed from the Dutch administration to the English administration,

(1) On the late Caffre war. Vol. LXII, n. CXXVI, p. 457.

135

but it gave us no occasion to celebrate any improvement in the lot of the natives. The English however, are the only ones who have felt some real sympathy for the peoples among whom they sent their colonists; who have recognized their rights, who have seriously proposed to protect, to civilize

them, and to make them happy. This is a feeling that honors them, we find it in government, in the nation's deputies, in British writers, but it is not found amongst the colonists. These, raised in the midst of this animated struggle within all their professions, this emulation to if anything 'make it rich', which mainly characterizes England and the heightened embarkation for the colonies in the present century; imbued with the thought that their first affair should be concerned foremost with the earning of money, and that any consideration of the universe with its inhabitants, better be left to sort itself out. English greed is not like that of the other nationalities who preceded them in this career. The Spanish, the Portuguese, both taking it for granted that the means to get wealthy is the very same thing as wealth itself, only thought of collecting gold and silver. They thus searched for precious metals with a disorderly passion; they seemed to get drunk by their possession of it. The Dutchman instead was calmer, he combined the character of the usurer with that of the merchant; more coldly calculating the interests, the profits, the advantages of the monopoly, and what the ruin of others could bring him.

The Englishman wants to profit in order to spend and to enjoy. In his own career of fortune making, he never deprives himself of the 'comforts' of life; he combines luxury and elegance more than any other stricken with the greed affliction. No government is more dearly served, as the salary of officials in India is equal to the revenue of princes, and is entirely put to use in procuring for them, not just ease, but luxury. This elegance holds the English at a greater distance from the natives than all the other colonial peoples in Europe. It exposes them far less to private struggles, to hateful passions, but on the other hand it also leaves less room for sympathy, friendship, communications between intimate friends, that could hasten the progress of less advanced peoples. The English, especially the younger people, in their

interactions with the gentle and timid inhabitants of Hindustan, believe themselves called to hold at a distance in obedience and fear: 'those black fellows, the natives, these colored buffoons, who might well forget the difference in their nature'. As they are, however, the English are still the best masters that the Indians, in their caste society, encountered. Wherever their dominance is direct, in this vast continent, it has been a real benefit. They restored security and justice there, they gave peoples a feeling of duration and of the future, and precisely because they stood apart, because they did not want to be directing everything, changing everything, they allowed Indian civilization, be it below them, to resume its natural course; agriculture flourishes, the arts are cultivated with care, population and wealth is beginning to increase again, intelligence is making progress; and European opinions are naturally and gently grafted onto the old thoughts from India; finally, the conquered people have learned to defend foreign domination, the native army is formidable, and it is unlikely that if the road to India was open to the Russians, they would support the struggle against the English. The presence of the European, however, exercised on

India unmistakable fatal influences, as it hastened its demoralization; the adventurers who went there shook off all respect for public opinion; all the feudal princes or shady associates of the East India Company engage in a more or less shameful brigandage, and their subjects are more unhappy now because of the very fear that the English inspire in them, and tributes or gifts that their lords demand from them.

In their possessions in Canada, the English are no longer in direct contact, except with the least advanced of the people, those of the red race; they are societies of hunters who have been constantly retreating before the English colonists, and who have so diminished in number, that we can foresee the days when their race will be entirely destroyed. The immense continent colonized by the English, and which today forms the United States, was, like Canada, formerly occupied to the shores of the Atlantic by these tribes

137

of hunters and warriors who, practicing no industry, and almost no culture, and possessing no domestic animals, required a very large space for living. The new population, of European origin, who now inhabits this continent, undoubtedly surpasses infinitely in number the indigenous population that was destroyed; but is this advantage enough to excuse the usurpation?

Americans nowadays often present us, in imaginative writings, the rather fantastic picture of virtues, of happiness, of the skill, of the development of all the bodily faculties of the natives of these regions before the arrival of the Europeans. Without giving their stories an absolute belief however, we must recognize that in their civilization the natives were much more advanced than they are today.

Their ancient arts are lost; it is better for them to buy their clothes, their weapons, their utensils and tools, from the Europeans than to make them themselves; they are therefore bent on the destruction of game to obtain pelts, their only commodities, and thus they increase their misery more and more; those who remained in the midst of the English possessions, hardly ever wanted to submit their lives to agriculture; those who were pushed back to the West, forced into an ever more wandering life, have lost even the little bit of farming habits they had once acquired.

The French, the English, and the Americans, drawing them into their wars, providing them with weapons far more deadly than those they once had, so that the grim reaper has been hard at work everywhere among the cream of their warriors; but more than anything, most the Europeans have been poisoning the half-savage peoples with firewater. It is a great crime to have offered this disastrous drink to men that it necessarily stupefies.

The red man, who feels humiliated by the superiority of the whites, who is pushed back into indolence while everything around him is stirred up and in turmoil, who feels the sadness of his present being and the even greater sadness of the future, cannot resist the seduction of a gaiety, of an artificial excitement; he sacrifices everything he has, to get a hold of liquor, he immerses himself in the most disgusting drunkenness; and even when he comes out of it, he is stupid, he is incapable of all work, and it

does not take long for him to die. It is hard liquor which is depopulating the New World; it is the firewater that caused the richest to perish first; the 'Sachem', the chiefs of the people; and which imprints on the faces of the survivors that character of indolence and stupidity, so entirely contrary to that of their ancient warriors; it is this firewater which, perhaps in fifty or so years, will not let a single one of the natives survive. Drunkenness is undoubtedly a vice, and a misfortune for nations; but when wine, beer, cider, pulque, are the only drinks within reach, their effects are transient. Hard liquor, the manufacture of which requires chemical knowledge, is a product of civilization; but how could civilized peoples not have felt that it is a sacred duty for them not to ply drugs to barbarous peoples, destroying their health mercilessly without a chance of recovery? How can they justify having seduced them with opium in India and China, with coca in Peru, and with hard liquor in all places: Any colonist who carries firewater with him is necessarily a destructive plague for the region wherein he has settled. Liquor destroys the red race so swiftly that the United States could have spared itself the acts of fraud and cruelty by which it is still expelling some tribes of this race from the territory of the Union. It would have been enough for them to simply wait a few more years for the poison they are administering to take effect.

The colonies of the English in Australasia were found to be in contact with a race even more backward than the American reds, more dispersed, and as we have been assured, more ferocious in its habits. There can be no doubt however, that, regardless the penal colonies, the provocations are constantly initiated by the whites to the natives, from the powerful to the weak, and that the imminent destruction of all the natives of the southern lands is another crime to be added to those produced by the modern system of colonization.

A few generous men, inspired by their religion, left at the same time from England to spread civilization through the colonies, which do have a little more in common with those efforts of antiquity; because, like these, they seek success only in the progress of the natives. It was the missionaries who spread this out throughout the South Sea islands. But maybe these men, all focused on spiritual well-being, were too ill fitted to teach the rural arts; perhaps, filled with the importance of certain forms of faith, they paid too little attention to the progress of ideas; or perhaps, in their quest to convert the inhabitants of the Friendly Islands into proper English Methodists, they undertook this transformation too fast. True enough, the reports on these missions are contradictory; however, what seems the most certain, is that the introduction of: taxes, police, uniforms, fire arms, and more, into the South Sea islands has been leading to such a rapid reduction of the local people there, that it is unlikely to last any longer than another couple of generations or so.

The French, in turn, also had colonies; but perhaps more so than any of the other nations in Europe, it is them who have shown the most sympathy for the so-called 'barbarian' peoples; and who seem, therefore, the most suitable for civilizing them. Because of the inferiority of their navy, the French, in other parts of the world, have always had to dread the hostilities of rivals more powerful than them; and so they were never able to indulge in this arrogance of the superiority of their bayonets, that, concerning most of their neighbors, so often was substituted for law, justice, and affection. On the contrary, they sought the friendship of their hosts of another race, and they almost always were able to obtain it. Less attached to their own opinions and prejudices than any of the other European nations, less proud of their nationality, they were the most flexible of all to associate with the mores and habits of foreigners; their activities, their entrepreneurship, brought them wholehearted interest in the pleasures, as in the occupations, of wandering peoples.

140

Less greedy than the others, they pursued success in progress, rather than profit; and, when the society of their compatriots was outside of their reach, their sociability made them eagerly seek friendships with native populations. In Canada, in Louisiana, a close alliance was formed between the French and the red men; they became companions in life and in death, in as much for hunting as for conduct in war. French names, as much as French feelings, were found among the most formidable tribes occupying the borders of English America. The Frenchman, having become half-savage, had learned more from the American Indians than he had taught them.

He had become open to their opinions as well as to their habits; to them he had only communicated using his weapons and his pleasures. The rifle and the violin had entered the most savage countryside; and even today, the French villages that stand out in small numbers scattered among the vast colonies of English origin, can be recognized from afar, not because of their opulence, nor by the outstanding culture of the countryside that is surrounding the village, but by the punctuating sounds of joy that one can hear emanating from it; especially from Sunday dances, when the red men cheerfully unites with the white men. The violin, like the lyre of Orpheus, would have done more to civilize the woods of America, than commerce or philosophy; it would have taught the men of both races to love and to unite.

The settlers of Canada and Louisiana were farmers; by that they retained the character of the most amiable and esteemed part of the mother nation. Colonists of the West Indies, French Guyana, and the islands of France and Bourbon, came from its towns; they belonged to a more calculating class, more greedy for gain, more tainted with the vices of trade; vices only, because they were generally those whose misconduct had attracted setbacks, and who passed these characteristics on to the colonies. They found there a population that had formed from the remains of buccaneers

and other outlaws. These savage adventurers, scum of the French nation, had taken heed in their ferocity as much as their greed in conducting their corsair haunts in the West Indies, where they had based themselves for plundering the Spaniards. They were recruited again

141

for a long time as deportees soiled with crimes; because the government still considered its rich sugar islands only as penal colonies. The French however did not have any part in the extermination of the inhabitants of the Antilles, they had already perished under the Spanish yoke. The first conquerors had transported them to the continent, to work and die in the mines. But the French were not so free from criminal conduct towards the African race. In the islands they owned off the coast of Africa, they first destroyed, in slavery, all the natives there, then they took their workshops as slave trade and other buildings, and they imported unfortunate people, kidnapped by brigandage in Madagascar, and the coast of Mozambique, to continue the work which they themselves refused to do.

The crimes of the slave trade and slavery have stained the Antilles and the Guyanas even more deeply. Not only did the Europeans never civilize these regions through their colonial work, but even after having destroyed all the inhabitants in so many places, they renewed it two or three times over, in the course of two centuries; perishing the entire population, by an endless torment. And yet, among all the Europeans who soiled themselves by these horrors, the French were the least barbaric. Less greedy than the other planters were, less wealthy, and still living on their own in the midst of their negroes, instead of entrusting them to business agents, to factors separated from them by the vast ocean, they are recognized, among the various slave countries, as the least cruel.

France now has only a very small part of its former colonies left, and its descendants there are no longer in contact with the natives. But the recent conquest of Algeria has opened up new possibilities to extend civilization. The time has come when the European race can pay off the debt it owes to mankind; whereto it can carry freedom, justice, agriculture, philosophy, all arts of peaceful coexistence, from port to port, from shore to shore, on the

142

shores of the same Mediterranean Sea that the Greeks once covered with their colonists. The Arab and Moorish people, with which the French find themselves in touch, already have shown themselves to be well capable of the highest civilization. Already all the most important steps, all the most difficult to do in the line of progress, have been taken. The country has been oppressed for a long time, it has suffered much, and so it will feel the advantages of security, equal rights and benevolence more keenly. Under a fair government, bit by bit over time, the yield of a wonderful agriculture could be recovered that the same region once introduced to Granada and Valencia, as this region is no less fertile than the one in Spain, and which is hardly any smaller in extent. It's been three times now that civilization

has been brought to this same people, in this same country, first by the Phoenicians and Carthaginians, by Romans, and by Arabs, and each time it produced its most precious fruits there. It's almost nine centuries now that the arts, letters, sciences, everything that today makes up the glory of Europe, already flourished in Cairo, while our forefathers were plunged into barbarism. Will the French show themselves to be less capable of bringing order, peace, happiness, and cultivation, to the spirit of North Africa than the successors of Mohamed were? Instead of spreading benefits, will they continue this war of extermination that they have already started? By provoking the Moors and Arabs and forcing them into battle, will they burn the towns and villages, and will they repel into the deserts the two and a half million inhabitants they found in the regency of Algiers at the time of their invasion, and who, under a characteristically paternal government, could become the seed of a great people? After so many fatal examples that the colonies of Europeans have been presenting to the world in the last three centuries, the choice that the French nation is about to make between a progression of real benefits and that of crimes makes one shudder, and the dread redoubles again when the complaints, when the public's denunciations of acts of plunder and cruelty are greeted in the legislation with the cry: 'You are dishonoring the nation!' or when the concessions, when the recognition

145

of the rights of the Moor, when the peace treaties, which can serve as a support for benevolence, are rejected as acts of cowardice. How about? the one who would be dishonoring the nation would be the one showing an indulgence for oppressors' packages! The one who dishonored the nation would be the one who would prefer the false rights of conquests and cruel violence over the gentle influence of setting examples, using persuasion, and bestowing blessings.

It is not about transporting a few thousand French settlers, a few thousand adventurers on the shore of Africa; and it is not a question of founding a few experimental farms in the Mitidja plain, so we can boost the share value of some companies of speculators; it is to bring in two and a half million subjects, or better still allies, of France, of Arabs having recovered the hope and pride of their nationality, in a career path to happiness and progress; it is to give back to any Algerian farmer the security he has long lost, so that he will set out for more yield from these fertile fields; all the rich products that his fathers extracted from them in the past, and that at the same time he is enlightened, as directed by French scientific know-how, which will join forces with him, to teach him to do even better. It must be France's task to raise the standard of living, to make all these cities, all these villages which were once the abode of a great people, prosperous again; to revive their arts, their industries, their factories, which formerly offered so many objects of exchange to Europeans; and to help the submitted Moors as well as the allied Moors to take advantage of all the progress of science to increase their industrial arts.

It must be France's task to inoculate Africa with civilization, and not to cauterize it with iron and fire; return to Mauritanian local authorities, the towns and villages that the country's ancient customs took for granted as being theirs, to assure the former inhabitants of the country, the benefits of a municipal administration and a prompt justice by enlightening them, for the government and for jurisprudence, thanks to the social sciences having been cultivated in Europe;

144

renew old studies and brilliant Arabic literature, while relating it to the progress of the spirit of the Franks. Finally, it must be the task of France to maintain the beneficent influence among Muslims of the religion of Mohamed, while freeing it from a crude fanaticism that was introduced there by despotism and ignorance, while making it converge with the charity and the philosophy of the Christian religion; to unite men by their religious feelings and remind them of their brotherhood, instead of setting them off against each other. If such could be the fruits of the conquest of Algeria, humanity would have in France some eternal obligation, and France would collect not fame alone, but most importantly: more lasting material benefits.

POST SCRIPTUM.

The French government nobly responded to the desire of what we have been expressing here, by the Treaty of Tafna, of May 30 1837, with Abdel-Kader. He gave a great example moderation, justice, respect for the rights of a foreign people; and his conduct is all the more meritorious in seeking peace, since the two oppositions to that notion, by party spirit – the colonists out of greed, and the whole nation perhaps, for the sake of false glory. urged him to conduct himself to the contrary.

The war against the regency of Algiers was just: it was a government of privateers who had put themselves outside the law of nations, who insulted Europe by their brigandage, and whose existence should not have been tolerated for as long as it lasted. The Turkish militia of Algiers, which ruled the city and tyrannized the surrounding province, was not a

145

Moorish nation. Victory over the Turks did not establish a right for the French over the country where the Turks were raising a tribute from. But the yoke was broken, the Moors returned to their independence; and their joy, it is assured, had been lively, when at the time of the capture of Algiers they had believed their nationality had been revived. These people, who took the first steps in education and civilization, and who once also showed how much it is perfectible, were ready to re-enter the path toward progress and to become attached to France; to which the greatest blessing should have been due, that of having overturned an odious tyranny. It was

a great mistake to have considered the capture of the capital as equivalent to the conquest of the kingdom, or the victory over the Turks as a defeat of the Moors. The fact was not any more in favor of the French than the law. The country with the name of the kingdom of Algiers had not been conquered, not even traversed by the French; the Moors had not been defeated, they hadn't even been fought. But now is not the time to pick up on past faults when the present is worthy of praise. The sentiment of the Moors had not been known, had not been understood in France; and the difference in religion, of language, and of manners, suffices to explain this ignorance, which many other causes still could maintain.

When the Moors organize themselves, however, when they put a skillful and generous leader as their head of state, when they see that they are able to govern themselves, when they claim their independence based on the memories of their ancient glory, all generous hearts must unite with them, and assist the poor, weak, scattered people with their vows, which resists the usurpation of the strong. The war started under the most disastrous auspices; it took on a character that would not have been long in becoming atrocious; and we had already arrived at the question, as to whether or not it was necessary to propose the extermination of the Moor, whom it was not enough to subjugate, as he would always resist, and who would always contemplate vengeance.

The Algiers war could undermine slowly, and for a long time in the

following years, the finances and the army of France; but above all, and one could not think of it without shuddering, the war in Algiers could only result in extending the desolation over a vast land, to roll back the Moorish nation towards barbarism; and to leave between it and the Europeans, the seeds of an eternal hatred.

The Treaty of Tafna gives the Moors their existence back; this is roughly putting them back into a relationship recognition and friendship, where they thought they were at after the fall of their oppressors. No doubt a lot of seeds of distrust, of jealousy, and perhaps also of resentment, remain in their hearts; it will take skill and care to fully regain their benevolence; it will take a severe vigilance on the part of the French colonists whom, in their relations with their new neighbors, and bearing the pride of a great nation, will undoubtedly give more than one cause of offense. But if peace can be maintained during the first years, if good neighborly relations begin to form, French sociability will soon be operating its true conquests, the influence of instruction by example will act on the Moors, and the colony of Algiers will become as civilizing as were the colonies of antiquity. Fortunately its borders have been tightened; these still exceed by a lot what French settlers could populate as cultivators, what they could even cultivate together with African sharecroppers. It is on the territories that are surrounding the cities of Algiers and Oran, that France must henceforth lead its civilizing efforts, and not open it up to a whole field of companies with their greedy speculators, nor to shareholding companies, who would bring gambling and trading there instead of agriculture and commerce; but

to multiply in the countryside – the industrious workers, in the cities – the sober, modest, and active bourgeois, so everywhere a population which is already settled there and does not come from elsewhere to seek fortune. Instead the idea becomes to make the country fortunate, while bringing it the industrial arts of France, the experience of France, the sedentary mores of France; so that for Africa it becomes a model colony, a mutual teaching

147

operation, from which sciences, customs, and laws will spread far and wide among its neighbors who are also susceptible to culture, and eager to move forward to take their position on the path of civilization.

SECOND SECTION:

COMMERCIAL WEALTH AND PEOPLE IT SUPPORTS.

THIRTEENTH ESSAY

The Economic Organization of Human Society.

None of the social sciences has, in the course of the last century, been cultivated with more zeal than political economy; none can have more names illustrated by the scope of its knowledge or nobility of character; among its writers, none has as many deep thinkers and philosophers. If there is one, Adam Smith, whom we would regard in particular as our teacher, we could name several that we are honored to call our friends, many who unite in our eyes, and in their mind and soul, whatever should inspire respect.

It is therefore not without a feeling of mistrust and fear, that we find ourselves walking on an absolutely different path from theirs, that we successively have been developing a system which also deviates from all those, that they have followed. Economists do not set worldly events into motion, like an industrialist would, they just observe and explain them. We do not therefore attribute the world's sufferings to them; but the

difference between them and us is that, observers like us are detecting a whole new direction that the human spirit is following today, obsessed with an industrial ardor that seems to capture all states of mind; that of an eagerness to innovate, to perfect, to produce in all the industries, in all the applications of forces that are beyond human beings. They applauded the ardor with all their heart, they called on all the latent energies to support them, to compete with one another to go ever faster; while us, on the contrary, we have only felt the alarm set off by this movement which is dragging society along with it. We have pointed out its many unfortunate consequences in the present; we also announced more troublesome ones to come about in the future; and we have called on all thinkers, all the decent people, all friends of humanity, to help us to hold back, to delay the social raft, which, in its accelerated race, seems to us to rush towards the abyss. Such a different appreciation of the effects of social movements, for us is not the consequence of the spirit of the system, because we started by fully adopting the principles of the dominant school; and it was only slowly, as driven by the facts, by the observations, that we were forced into giving up one after the other. The sufferings of society hit us, at the very time when its marvelous progress was being celebrated. Better versed in history than the other economists, and consequently more ready to compare the present

times with those of the past, we sought to determine who were the ones reaping the fruits of all the wonders of the industrial arts, as these were taking place before our eyes; of this dazzling activity that at the same time multiplies its human forces, those of capital, its means of transportation, and the interrelationships between all of them; of this fever, which makes us all live so fast, arising from a systemic rivalry that makes us all work in competition with, and trying to supplant, one another. We searched, and while we have recognized the triumph of things in our century, it seemed to us that man shared in consuming the fruits more badly than ever before. The industry of our century differing most completely from that of past centuries, was the progress of the manufacturing industry. It was the first object presented to our admiration; for it is through

151

the application of the sciences to the industrial arts that man nowadays has acquired such a great command over nature, in that it forces all its elements into performing a human kind of work; in that machines driven by wind, water, and steam, with apparent skill and precision, thereby can exempt the worker from any apprenticeship. Children from the age of six can be employed, and no one asks them of possessing intelligence nor of any morality, while they go about producing. It is in these factories that capitals, greater than what industry has ever employed, are united in one hand, led by a single head; it is in the factories that thousands of men, women, and children are assembled for the interest of a single master whose single will is to be obeyed.

We took note of all of this indeed, and our first feeling was that of astonishment and admiration, for such a great development of human ingenuity and power. At the same time we recognized the promptitude and the perfection of a work, which would have seemed more wonderful to our fathers than the activities of those financial wizards whom they were so disposed to believe. But when we then wondered who enjoys it all; when, turning our eyes away from things and relate the output of work to men instead, we wanted to see the happy people created by this tremendous progress in industry; and then we started to recognize how utterly false this progress in fact is.

Who are the lucky ones, due to this progress in manufacturing? Without a doubt, this must first of all be asked from England, because this country has so much surpassed all others in industrial development, its capital is so immense, its machines so perfected, its knowledge so directly employed in the service of the industrial arts, which its successes causing jealousy and emulation in all other nations. Again it is of England, that this question has to be asked and in particular with respect to its cotton industry.

This manufactory, which alone supplies half of England's exports, four times that of wool, eight times more than that of burlap, twelve times more than that of hardware; this industry, which employs fifteen hundred thousand workers of all ages and sexes, and which henceforth is to be considered as supplying strongest foundation for British prosperity.

And who are the happy ones? Ah well! of course, they are not the fifteen hundred thousand workers it supports. Later we will get back to bringing out some of the details of the cotton manufacturing system; to note some of its horrors as these have been exposed in the various surveys ordered by parliament. We will then see that these unfortunate workers, living in a constantly heated atmosphere above 80 degrees Fahrenheit or about 27 degrees Celsius, breathing air impregnated with cotton particles, tainted still further through oil and other miasmatic emanations, rarely reach the age of forty, and at that age they are almost always dismissed as no longer fit for work; that for the most part they have aged before their time in misery, filth, and vice; that the main work is done by unhappy children between the ages of six and thirteen, in earlier times sold by beggars' prisons, today sold by their parents; sold, we say, for their labor is forced by punishment, and the wages are not for them; that all their intellectual developments, as well as all the pleasures of life are forbidden to them by relentless work; that they can only be kept awake by body blows, because of the fatigue to which they succumb; that they were made to work up to fourteen hours a day and more; that a statute of the parliament obtained for their protection, finally reduced their work to twelve hours a day, but that this beneficent intention has been frustrated by the acceleration of machines; this is such that, while the child who, in order to spin, is obliged to follow the speed of his trade, doing eight miles of thread a day in 1815, was obliged in 1832 to do twenty and even twenty-five. This continuous walking, joined to work, has the most disastrous effects on health. Doctors' reports on diseases and mortality of the workers employed in cotton factories make one shudder. So, far from wondering if the cotton factory provides the happiness of the fifteen hundred thousand English workers who are employed there, one must rather

ask if any pecuniary benefit for a nation can ever compensate for the sacrifice of one and a half million individuals, whose health is being destroyed, whose life is shortened by half, whose education is suppressed, to make room for an unrelenting work, whose intelligence is stifled, whose morality is corrupted, in which the very love of parents for their children is sacrificed to greed (1).

But if the happy ones that the manufacture makes are not its workers, perhaps they are the masters? We will observe first of all that these lucky people are not numerous: in 1835, between England and Scotland twelve hundred and sixty-two factories in the cotton industry were counted. However this is far from the number of owners being as large as well; as most of them, in fact, own several factories.

But let us not stop at this consideration; the total employed capital of the cotton manufacturing industry is estimated at 34 million sterling; from this would follow that each owner has made advances from 26 to 27 thousand pounds sterling on average per factory. The nation should not be called

upon to make great sacrifices in order to provide ease to those who already have such a fortune. But in fact those who start with such a small amount of capital, with 600,000 francs as in France, are sure to ruin themselves: the monopoly of wealth is irresistible in factories. The road to fortune is open to all those who start with a few hundred thousand pounds, but it is closed to all other contestants. And the commercial registers attest to the fact that the number of bankruptcies in cotton manufacturing, has been constantly growing with new inventions hitting the market, each of which destroyed the value of fixed capital tied up in previous inventions. But the happy ones made by such manufacturing, we are told next, is not its producers, it is the consumers. The former work to provide enjoyments for the latter; the more work they do, the more cheaply they can do it,

(1) A summary of these horrors can be seen in the Quarterly Review, No. 114; The Factory System p. 396.

154

and the more abundant these pleasures become. So the cotton industry uses two thousand times more raw material, it does two thousand times more work than it did in 1791, while at the same time it sells its products six or seven times cheaper than earlier was the case; and cleanliness, the health of the poor consumer, must increase with the abundance of cotton placed therefore within their reach.

Very good; but if this is the advantage of manufactures, a nation must desire not to have this advantage itself, but that others have it for it. In 1833, England consumed products of its cotton factories for 12,879,693 pounds sterling, while it exported 18,459,000 pounds worth.

It was therefore the nation which sacrificed the intelligence, happiness, morality, health, and lifespan, of fifteen hundred thousand of its citizens, for this abstract benefit of consumers, of which it reserves only two-fifths for itself, while leaving three-fifths of it to strangers, who themselves have no moral sacrifice to make whatsoever to acquire it.

Moreover, a closer examination of this benefit to the consumer, in fact soon fades the importance of it all.

Enter the household of the poor Englishman, and then the one of the poor French, Italian, German, workers, whose habits are not yet changed by the recent introduction of factory-made products. Which one owns the most cotton products? Certainly it must be the Englishman; yet hardly ever will one find as many white goods there as in the German, French, and Italian homes of the same condition, has dozens of pairs of sheets; the same is true of any other kind of cloth. But the value of this English wardrobe is also inferior in its quality. Each pair of hemp sheets that the good French housewife weaves is worth four to six times, the pair of cotton sheets that the English housewife buys; likewise, the woolen set of clothing of a first valentine date infinitely more than the cotton clothes of the second; if one sells the furniture and wardrobe of the first one, one will get ten times and even twenty times the value than one will get of the second. So who gains

by this difference? It certainly is not the English poor. That society is set up in such a way that the

155

working poor earn nothing beyond their subsistence; they eat potatoes instead of bread, wear rags instead of clothes, and their wages will be immediately adjusted to what is sufficient for them to live. They will be living well in the case of continental Europe, badly in the British Isles; their assets will generally be worth something in the first, but nothing in the second. It is never them who can take advantage of any small savings, sometimes it is the rich who employs them, but more often it is nobody. So our first research, as soon as we shifted our focus on taking care of people and no longer on things, we became sensitive to an at first sight so dazzling prosperity in fact being fallacious. We therefore tried to make one aware that industrialism was following the wrong path; we showed that machines were removing the bread from the reach of artisans, universal competition, reducing the legitimate benefits of all labor, exuberant over-production suffocating the poor instead of providing them with abundance, and from then on we were greeted with an almost universal clamor. We were reproached for being the enemy of enlightenment and progress: we were asked derisively how we could believe in a surplus of production, while so many poor people were in need. We were accused of answering with children's tales, and summoning a giant who represented the force of the wind, another one the force of water, and another one the force of steam, and we were asked if we would advise man to be foolish enough to refuse their assistance, when they offered to do human work. Our answers would have made little impression, time has responded for us. Industrialism has worked, production continued to increase, but with it also increased the distress of the producer. Manufacturing crises used to recur in cycles of a few years, nowadays it lasts just a few months, a few weeks even. If we randomly open whatever daily English newspaper, we are sure to find there all the details of a terrible misery, in one or another of the manufacturing districts. The business seems like a patient in a state of a burning fever,

156

one can't help but be astonished and frightened by the prodigious rapidity of its pulsations (1). We have taken turns looking at all the significant economic wonders of our century; everywhere we have seen the progress of things, and everywhere the suffering of men. But none of these much-vaunted inventions could provide an answer to this simple question: where are these happy people that resulted from them? How many wonders have been attributed to the banking system; what wonders have we not expected from the creative power of credit?

(1) In Nottingham it is the factories of stockings and those of lace which are supposed to exemplify the prosperity of the city; but, during the first three months of this year they

suspended almost all work, and on April 26 a crowd of two thousand dismissed workers successively visited the bakers 'and butchers' shops to solicit their charity. (Galignani) In Sheffield and Birmingham, it is the metal trade that is the spine of its economy. There were not less than thirteen thousand workmen without work in Birmingham in the month of June. They were first seen walking the streets in bands of four or five thousand; later, they considered it wiser to divide themselves into small troops of perhaps twenty or thirty individuals; they will knock on all doors; the owners of the house are called, one of the workers tells them that they are without work, that their wives and children are starving, and they ask for their charity. But what charity would not be powerless to alleviate such needs, all at the same time! (Galignani, June 12, 16, and 2; nos. 6943, 6947, and 6955) However, all these manufactures put together, do not even come close to the importance of the cotton industry; so no distress can be compared to that of the fifteen hundred thousand workers that cotton is supposed to support.

157

Indeed, it was a phenomenon worthy of admiration that this substitution of rags [paper money], as one of the most unworthy material on which the arts of man are exercised, for that of those metals which are precious par excellence, that this great national economy, that this facility acquired in exchange, values, regardless of great distances; that this capital market is always open, that this eagerness of lenders to look everywhere for valid borrowers, that this power given to people with little wealth, to offer the use of a united wealth to whoever wants it. Twenty years ago we strove to convey an understanding that the banking industry was dangerous for the public fortune; how, instead of creating something, it was only borrowing the national property, with specie circulated by the State, and only leaving an insecure pledge. At the time we ran afoul of the banking establishment, as well as all those who wanted to borrow from banks; we have not been listened to, and just about every day, still again this year, we have seen the creation of new banks, somewhere.

But where are all these happy people, because of what this system did for them? It is not the merchants who, abusing a credit offered under too easy terms, launched companies above their strength in running them, and have gone bankrupt; it is not the capitalist business raiders, whose adventures came to spoil the profession, by replacing legitimately existing commerce with the chances of their game; it is not the bankers themselves, because we could not find any evidence that their speculation did not overturn a greater amount in old fortunes. And so we walked from recklessness to recklessness until the current crisis, which begins with the embarrassment of merchants and bankers in America, that is shaking the commerce of the world, and which is threatening to cause an absolute ruin of those banks whose prudence we hitherto had been admiring.

We could follow any other economic inventions that saw the light in our century, and ask of each one in the same way: where are those happy ones that it has been producing? But we don't want to raise such a great mass of prejudices all at the same time; as we have already felt the disadvantage of attacking all the commonly held opinions, interests, and expectations. We also thought that we had to familiarize our readers with the particular line of reasoning we proposed to follow, before looking for the fundamental principles of science.

So we latched onto the oldest, to the most important, or rather the most necessary, of the divisions of human labor – agriculture; to understand through that sector, the economic organization of the whole of society. Indeed, the farmer is, among all working men, the one who most clearly sees the destination of his work in front of him; everyone else can be done without, but no one can do without him. When he delivers his produce to commerce, their value exceeds that of the products of all other industries combined; but he himself doesn't need to trade, his existence does not depend on any exchange he has to do with men, his subsistence is ensured by the exchange that he makes with the earth alone. So, his condition precedes all the complications within a society; his is a simple existence, and the influences that cause his happiness or his misfortune are easy to understand.

Agricultural wealth, however, like all others, excited greed; the condition of the cultivator, as all others, experienced oppression. We searched what had been the consequences both in barbarian times and in civilized times; we attached our line of reasoning primarily to the latter, however, as being richer in providing instructions for us. The spirit of industrialism has had effects; which nowadays have also entered into agriculture; it has even been considered as a manufacture; as a famous economist defined it by these words: "A manufacture of products by rural people who thrive whenever they either get more products for the same costs, or the same amount of products for lower costs." But it is of the essence of the manufacturing system to centralize, to confuse the interests of the owners with that of society; the manufacturing manager or, for that matter, a farmer counts the maintenance of his workers among his highest costs: the first economy he proposes is that of the lives

of the human beings he employs. We have studied this system in several of the countries that have adopted it, and we queried in those the emanating happiness.

It is from England that the impetus comes to us today in almost all the social sciences; England marches at the head of industrialism; it is the one also that, with the most zeal and intelligence, applied its principles and calculations to agriculture; it is the one showing us in its perfection the system of large farms. Indeed, when one limits one's gaze to things only, it is impossible to contemplate its results without admiration. Nowhere there does agriculture need to be further perfected, nowhere is all its equipment better understood, its buildings, its farming fields are nowhere in better condition, its breeds of cattle more beautiful, its products of the fields more perfect; nowhere even is picturesque beauty better combined with utility. And although England, according to the system it adopted, sought to produce these wonderful products with the fewest men possible; even though it has reduced its population in the agricultural sector to a lower proportion than any other country in the world; and although this nation at

the same time is a manufacturing nation par excellence, the first of its interests are still agricultural interests. The rural population is still more numerous than those of all England's manufactures combined; the value of England's rural products is still superior to that of all the other products. Without attaching an undue importance to statistical reports, we will borrow only this one from an English economist: The annual value of products from rural areas in Great Britain destined for the sole food of man, grew, from the year 1755 to the year 1835, by seventy-two million pounds sterling. This increase alone, and therefore equal to more than twice the total value of the products of the cotton industry, to more than three times the interest on the public debt (1).

(1) Edinburgh Review, 1st January 1836, no. 124, p. 321.

160

But when, looking back at the effect of things on men, we next seek the happiness produced by this great agricultural prosperity, when we ask where are all these fortunate people that this system has created, the same phenomenon is represented to us again. The great mass of the English nation descended from the condition of peasant to that of day laborer; it lost all share in the landed property, any guarantee to future well-being; it is obligated to unceasingly resort to live by the aid of the poor tax; and these reliefs today are no longer granted than under conditions of captivity, like a separation from husbands and wives; under a penitentiary regime, that gives it all the characteristics of a punishment. At the same time, both other classes of the nation who share the fruits of agriculture, farmers and landlords, complain of impending ruin, they cry out for protective laws, monopolies; they claim that they cannot compete with the price of foreign wheat; and indeed, many farmers go bankrupt, many owners voluntarily give up a quarter or a third of their rents. And finally, at the same time, frequent fires of crops and of rural houses speak volume about an irritation and rising unrest of day laborers in agriculture, and the precarious state of society as a whole.

Now is the time to seek an explanation of these so seemingly contradictory facts, to find out where the deception of the system of industrialism stems from, to show how the economy's substance was abandoned to chase after shadows instead, to finally substitute for chrematistics, or the science of abstract wealth, true political economy, or the knowledge of household and community rules.

This research necessarily brings us back to the most abstract notions of science, with the most contested definitions, to a whole logomachy that we have long sought to avoid, but which finally must be approached to show how fallacious it is; that must be addressed, but without hope to be much more convincing to our adversaries.

Also, after indicating the point where we believe they have not only lost their way, but are totally lost, we will abandon these abstractions to return to the realm of facts again.

So far we have concerned ourselves with the goods produced by the soil and the men who work it, who then divide the yield among themselves. These goods are not only useful, they are necessary for those who make them come about; also, their value is intrinsically more 'just' than those commonly referred to by this name; it exists independently of any trade that may follow, it precedes all commerce. But now we come to the goods that industrialists produced for the use of others, and not for his own use, goods that do not begin to be useful until the moment arrives where they become exchanged, which consequently necessitates the trade or the artifact of exchanges. We defined them under the concept of commercial wealth, and we refer to all property which are only thus appreciated by their exchangeable value.

What is their value, however? Don't these goods have a real value that is independent of market fluctuations? The goods that are most necessary for life: air, water, fire, for example, are these all worthless? It's here that a chaos, a confusion of ideas from which it was impossible for them to escape, presented itself to the minds of economists. There has not been one of them who has given us a new definition of the word – value; which has not been conducive to avoid the inconsistency of not knowing how to distinguish between what is useful to man and what for him is useless; which has not been analyzed separately, and neither was the price of production, and the price of desires, the price of monopoly, the real price, the nominal price, and many other modifications; which only served to make the notions more confusing still.

We remember seeing, in an Italian newspaper, twenty definitions of the words price and value borrowed from the various philosophers of the science and compared. There were not two identical ones among them, not two that convey exactly the same idea. We won't try to be more precise than we have been already, nor more satisfactory than those who came before us. We will take the word 'value' such as usage gives it to us, with the degree of ambiguity that will stay attached. We will only notice that there is one of

its meanings, the etymological meaning, on which there is no doubt, it is the exchangeable value, it is the equality of a thing to something else, for which the trade is ready to barter.

We have, with good reason, admired the brotherhood in commerce that was established among men, their activities by which they have been making their contributions to the common utility, the notions of justice, and the equality by which it has spread; but we did not so far make note of, to what extent it deprives riches off their primitive character of utility, a characterization that the imagination still continues to bind it to, and how anyone is left with their exchangeable value. It is the opposition between the usance value which everyone feels in themselves, and the exchange value to which commerce has reduced everything, which now makes it

impossible to give a satisfactory definition of these various words, price, value, wealth. But the effects of amphibology do not stop there. It is the confusion between the significance of a useful value and that of a value only insofar it is indeed exchangeable, which lies at the bottom of the deception that modern systems of a chrematistic approach exude in their explanations. As long as men work to satisfy their own needs, and they exchange between them only their superfluity, utility remains for them the true measure of values, and an increase in the quantity of a useful thing is a certain increase in wealth. The farmer who eats the wheat that he himself grows will never hesitate to say that he is twice as rich with twenty sacks of wheat than with ten sacks. He will persist in reasoning like this, or at least roughly, even though he sells one or two bags of this wheat that he happens to have too many of this year, at a lower price than he could have sold them for in years past. The housewife who spins and weaves fabrics herself will also reason that she is twice as rich with twenty ells than with ten, regardless it so happens if getting rid of one or two of them would be at a different price. In its primitive state, the patriarchal state of society, trade did exist too; but it definitely did not absorb the economy in its entirety. Then it only concerned the surplus of each person's output, and not on what

163

constitutes its very existence. It takes essential riches to satisfy the needs of man, but in no way does this mean that when these riches increase in quantity, they increase precisely by as much in value. But the condition of our century, the characteristics of our economic progress is that trade has taken charge of the distribution of the totality of the wealth produced annually and that consequently it has absolutely suppressed the attribute of useful value; leaving in place only that of exchangeable value. As professions, artisanships, trades, have given way to manufactures, all of their products were delivered to commerce, so that these could be distributed. When large farms were substituted for small ones, the farmer's consumption of rural products was found to be small in proportion to the quantity he had to sell; so that almost all the fruits of agriculture have become part of commercial wealth. Therefore the use value was destroyed for the farmer as well as for the manufacturer, and only exchangeable value has remained in its place. Since then, both of them have become victim, and the public and the philosophers fell prey to a very natural illusion and were victims right alongside them; believing to increase production values when their quantity or their usefulness was increased, while in truth, as their exchangeable value was always still the same, no progress had been made. The farmer who had perfected his agriculture, not all by himself of course, but as one among many, so that his wheat now returned him eight for one instead of four, may well have believed to have doubled their revenue; nothing had changed though, because the measure he previously sold for

eight ecus was not worth more than four now. This miscalculation seemed to him accidental; he would instead be blaming the seasons, foreign trade, the lack of government protection; but he should have accused only the very nature of commerce itself. This loss in value, due of the abundance of products, is even more sensitive in factories. One hundred ells of cotton fabrics are sold today for a price that would not have procured just ten ells thirty years ago. This should not be seen as a

164

tenfold increase in the aliquot part of the national wealth; the ten ells of old were equal to the hundred of today. When the exchangeable value does not increase, the trade counts the increase in quantity for nothing.

As soon as trade took hold of all products of human labor, all production has been subordinated to a single great circumstance which determines its value is a sale or a pull from another direction. The products are in no way still positive quantities, aliquots of wealth; but as long as they remain in the hands of the producer or the retailer-distributor, a final sale only to the one who has a need to consume them, and indeed able to compensate the seller for obtaining them at a price greater than what is on offer by anyone else, determines their value. Selling them imparts the character of wealth, and this sale, as we sought to make understood in one of our first Essays, can be effected in a sustainable manner only through the exchange of the annual product against annual revenue; so that, in the final analysis, it is this revenue which determines the true value of the goods produced in anyone period; and if the quantity of these goods increase without the revenue against which they must be exchanged also increases, their value will not increase.

The reality of what needs to happen in commerce is an exchange of the social product versus the social revenue, or the product of a human being against someone's revenue. When this distribution is stuck to, one is doing a service to all those between whom exchanges are settled, and, for his part, the accommodating merchant deserves a retribution, a commercial profit which cannot be denied. But it is very difficult for a merchant to have such broad views, or to form a correct idea of how it all functions. He does not think in general terms, but of appropriating as much as he can of the revenue floating about in exchange for the products at his disposal. Each producer seeks to under-sell his colleagues, to attract by price cutting some buyer to oneself and in preference to some other merchant who will thus not be able to sell. His operation therefore takes on the character of a game and no longer that of a business; his profit is

165

haphazard, or based on the loss made by another, and neither because of a quality of product nor on an advantage of all concerned; and the necessary, inevitable consequence of under-selling by a few is congestion for all, or the arrival on the market of a quantity of goods greater than the needs, and which can only be sold at a loss. The bulk of this excessive accumulation

is the scourge of commerce, and in the present state of society, when all products are delivered to a store for sale, when any usance value has given way to an exchangeable value; market congestion is one of the greatest plagues of humanity.

We hope to have at least hinted at the cause of the sufferings that recently have afflicted society; on the embarrassment and real impoverishment that could well have its counterpart in a conspicuous increase in wealth, seen as a prosperity in things, and adversarially affecting men. A production which is greater than the revenue which must be exchanged for the former may well have all the outward appearances of wealth; the competition between merchants to under-sell presents the image of the activity and prosperity of commerce, during which the heart of the matter may already have succumbed; while congestion, the most formidable of plagues for the producer, is yet holding out promises of abundance. We do not propose however, to provide more than a glimpse here of the cause of this dashing of hopes, just to give the impression that what seemed contradictory in terms, poverty increasing with abundance, could well have a reality; and thus providing a little rest to the mind, which almost always refuses to pay attention when it becomes aware that an argument is leading to results that are too contrary to any first notions. We hasten to return to more tangible substances that require less restraint of mind. The harder we tried to come up with a precise idea of what wealth is, to define what the value or the price of everything is; the more contradictions we discovered as to how it was previous defined, and so the more we believed in the fraudulence of this study. Wealth is only something when we consider it in relation to man, wealth is an expression of the relationship of things with man; but when wealth is

166

considered abstractly, as unrelated to the man who consumes it, or to the man who produces it, wealth is no more than an empty word. However, the science which is commonly called political economy, though the name of chrematistics is its proper designation, as its supposed goal is the study of the wealth from an abstract perspective, insofar this concerns the causes of its coming into existence and its eventual demise. We, on the other hand, reserve the name of political economy as being the study of the social organization of man in his relationship with things, man who consumes wealth and man who produces it. It's not just a distinction of words, we don't just give the name political economy a more extended meaning, and which as such would be inclusive of chrematistics; we instead hold the latter to be chasing a shadow without a reality; and we believe that, from one disappointment to another, it leads us to the goal precisely opposite to the one it holds to be true. The whole system of chrematistics can be summed up in two notions: to increase wealth one has to produce more, or to produce at a lesser cost. In its proposal to produce more, the distinction between usance value and exchangeable value is ignored; as it often happens to increase the quantity without increasing the wealth, that is, by pushing a continuous

development of an industry, attracts to that industry the most formidable of plagues, which is congestion. The proposal to produce at a lesser cost is the second advice of chrematistics, which loses sight of man in the pursuit of wealth altogether, and it is even more deceptive. Society, by having followed chrematistics advice, has walked from economy to economy; it tried hard to produce all items intended for commerce with the least amount of work possible; consequently cutting off from all the professions as many men as it was possible to do without; at the same time it forced those who were left to provide more labor for less pay. It strove to feed man in the most economical way, thus it first substituted bread for meat, later the

167

potato for bread; in the same way it cut off access to well-made clothing, and the low price of cotton fabrics allows a man and especially a woman to dress with spending ten times less than they used to spend. We have convinced the poor that their trousseaux, those great stores of linen, the copper utensils, the quality furnishings, the jewels, were ruinous advances, capital which was left idle without gathering profits; and so they were to limit his economic activities to the extent that all their furnishings, wardrobes, all they have in the world, would not be worth more than three months of their revenue. Time is saved accordingly; all communications be made more expeditious, and commerce is also rapidly serving as much as an empire now in the way that it once served only a city. But since then it has also been easy to understand that half, or perhaps three quarters of the former middlemen of commerce were useless, as the consumer would benefit from going directly to the wholesale merchant of the metropolis, who would send him everything he would need by return mail, so that we could suppress all the wholesale and retail merchants in the provinces and countryside, and with them most of the shopkeepers. But all that economy would not stop at people, since also all goods from warehouses could be removed, and so could all store supplies which, under the old system, were widespread throughout the country; that one had to imagine in arriving at such a great activity in transportation, that merchandise would hardly be detached from the control of manufacturers until it would be delivered to the consumer, because, thanks to the velocity of steam-powered railway cars, all this merchandise would spend only a few hours on its way rather than the weeks it used to be. Precious metals, in turn, have been the object of a similar economy. Chrematistics has imposed on most of society the replacement of its coins by banknotes, abusing a great value by using it in the making of numeraire; and, according to more than one philosopher, sterling silverware ought to be replaced by plated instead, and all the vain ornaments of the church by a worship that is less material and more spiritual. And here we are, we are assured, as a nation grows richer

168

by its economy, as it enriches itself by accomplishing ever more work at

lesser cost, because by then all his domiciles, could be almost empty of stores, all its shops and warehouses may be empty, all its freight wagons could be empty, and all its citizens' budgets can also be empty, just so that everyone's work can be done with half the labor; thus half the plowmen and half of the craftsmen will be able to dispense with living, while the other half will live for half the price of what it once paid.

How then does it happen that those who want to seek only wealth, present us instead with a wealth's image of the most appalling destitution?

This is because one can only succeed in understanding political economy as long as one constantly focuses on the advantage or well-being of man. Those, on the contrary, who claim to go back from man to the essence of things, very quickly manage no longer being able to distinguish the goal towards which they direct the efforts of society. This goal, which at first seemed to them a positive thing; takes on, the closer they get to it, an ever more vaporous, more insubstantial, form; and it ends up dissipating in a whiff of air.

We consider political economy, the rule of the house and the community, to be essentially a science of governance. No doubt, as an object of study and meditation, it is accessible to the most ordinary citizen, but it always resolves itself into advice given to a social authority, in display of the plan of conduct or influence that will be the most beneficial to society. One could say that the popular advice given to the government today, it is to continually promote the development of industry, it is towards this goal that one wants to converge all its studies, all its influence in political economy. But, in our opinion, one must direct one's gaze to a higher level, to what on the whole constitutes national happiness; that is to say on the relationships, on the proportions which must exist at various conditions, and between the various classes of citizens, for that all help each other, that all provide for the needs

of one another, that all unite hope with the feeling of security, that all finally, through the development of their energy, can gather the best conditions for happiness, can enjoy the activity in peace. Each or any isolated symptom of prosperity can be misleading; an increase in the population, or production, or export. or cash, does not prove that the nation is any the happier for it, nor even that it is getting richer; it is the proportion, it is the correct relationship between this progress with the population which determines all welfare; just as it is the proportion that exists between various professions which gives a society vigor and health of a well constituted body politic.

When, penetrated by this idea of a mutual interrelationship needing to exist between the various occupations, we contemplate the functioning of society, and seek out its economic organization leading to a happiness for all; we readily recognize that the basis of the social edifice can only be secured when the overwhelming body of the peasantry on which it rests is happy. Without doubt, the nation needs the food that its cultivators will provide, but it needs those farmers themselves even more. If its happiness

is assured, there is no class that is more attached to the public order, for perpetuity is marvelously combined with this condition; as the guarantee of order, to the most distant times, flows naturally from enjoying the fruit of its labors. No class has so much love for the country, from which its name peasant is derived; none will show more value for the defense of the country, because the very nature of its work strengthens health, exercising vigor and courage. It is therefore necessary to ask oneself, not with how much economy of willing hands one will be able to accomplish the work that needs doing, but, on the contrary: what are the conditions whereby one can maximize a rural population, to keep it there and to make it happy there by abundance. Social order can ensure peasants more happiness in the present as well as more security in the future, rather than for any other class of men who do manual work. It would be a very narrow minded and false way to consider them only as

170

wealth creators. They are, on the contrary, a goal themselves and one of the great goals of society; and a happy distribution of wealth should only be a means of ensuring their numbers, their happiness, and their bond to the country.

After the cultivators, the class most essential to the well-being of the nation is that of the landowners; those that in many countries are called: gentlemen farmers. Too often, no doubt, this class has been assigned the ownership of all the land in the country; and so it came to believe itself to be sovereign of the soil, and in full control of expelling anyone it wanted; moreover it believed that its own usefulness was the exclusive purpose of agriculture, and that its net profit was the same as the national profit. This error, into which its pride and greed had led it, has always been fatal to the nation, and almost always to itself too. The function of landowners' social life is to live intertwined with all peasants so as to civilize and spiritualize them, in some form or another. The outdoor life develops in them, as in the honest peasant, health, vigor, courage, love of order and love of the motherland. Ease, leisure, and education also impart intelligence and knowledge to come within their reach, contributing to the sentiments of human dignity and love of freedom. When the country's aristocracy maintains a relationship with the peasants only of benevolence, good neighborliness or association, it communicates its own virtues and its enlightenment to them, it directs them in the service of the homeland, it makes them participate in the science of agriculture, it civilizes their manners, it inspires them toward more elegant tastes; it thus makes, of all the inhabitants of the countryside, a homogeneous whole, united by trust and affection, which will make the nation strong in war for its defense, prosperous at home through abundant consumption and its continuous reproduction in which all take part. But if the landed gentry enters into a struggle with the peasants for enriching themselves at their expense, if it oppresses them, if it impoverishes and embitters them, if it is obliged to disarm them because it distrusts them; if it separates itself from them,

either by widening a social distance through pride, or by abandoning the countryside for the cities or the capital; then it does not perform any of the functions for which it was instituted, and it will exert no advantageous influence, either moral or intellectual on the great mass of the population. Far from raising its peasants up, it degrades them; far from strengthening the nation, it weakens and endangers it through internal discord; far from supplying commerce with consumers, it will be ruining the cities because the countryside had been impoverished first. The health of society thus demands the maintenance of a fair proportion between gentlemen farmers and peasants, their mutual independence at the same time as their union, the dissemination of the landed gentry in all parts of the countryside, the maintenance of an ease on all levels, so that everyone's consumption has a chance to increase, even more than the population.

The third order that society needs, to form a whole capable of sustaining life and gain prosperity, it is that of tradespeople, men who are working in the cities. When society was still in its formation, all the works on metals, stones, earth, wood, wool, hemp, the hides, by which men provided their accommodation, furnishings, clothing, utensils and tools, were embraced within the families of the first two classes; but these works, executed by men who were not really used to doing so, were rougher and much more imperfect than today, and they required much more time too. After the establishment of society was set up by agriculture, the women of each family continued reserving their time for weaving fabrics and stitching clothes; the men, who neither had the experience nor the need for houses in their former pastoral life, when they became cultivators, raised, as they still do in the new clearings of America, their huts (log-houses) through the mutual assistance of their neighbors. Metalworking however, required more strength, skill, and a constant habit; also the trade of blacksmith it seems

to have been preceded all the others: the Greeks put a blacksmith god on Olympus, as if to show that his craft belonged to the first origin of human society, and the history is lost in mythology, which tells of the advent, in Greece, of the Dactyls ideals, or the forge works of the Cyclops.

When the progress of the ease of the cultivators bit by bit brought about the formation of all other trades, to serve them, to build their houses, their furniture, their tools, their clothes, in exchange for part of the subsistence produced by agriculture, these craftsmen gathered among themselves in small towns or villages. They had to stay within reach of all countryside homes however, because the products of their industry are unlikely to transport, they most often went to exercise their trades in the places where it was required. They did no work except for the times when it was asked of them; consequently, they never had a store of funds, a capital which would wait for buyers, and whose exchangeable value diminished or disappeared if they could not sell it. Commerce didn't exist yet, the

products of labor were estimated because of their usefulness, or the hours of labor they had cost; a congestion of goods was not possible. And even today, we do not see the carpenter or the mason sell at a low price, for lack of applicants, the work that they have prepared. But we can certainly see a congestion of those willing to work in anyone craft. There may in a certain district well be more masons, more carpenters, more tradespeople, than the district wants to use, or can't reward.

So it's not the wealth whose value is wiped out by competition it is man himself. Society, with regard to tradespeople, must therefore propose to ensure that they are everywhere available, and that they are nowhere too numerous. There is a little embarrassment, a little bit of waiting, and some discomfort for all, if, in a certain region, there aren't enough carpenters, masons, blacksmiths, that the region in question would like to use and could reward; but there would

173

be very deep suffering for all these tradespeople, to the point of outright misery and mortality among them, if there are too many of them. Excess is therefore much more to be feared than a deficiency; and if society can exercise any vigilance over them at all, it must be to prevent, in any of these trades, that workers do not excessively increase beyond the need for them.

The fourth order is that of fabricators or manufacturers; that is what we call all those who prepare goods capable to be transported next, so that the involved latter trade then distributes them where they are needed.

These do not regulate their work on the demand which is made by the very ones who want to use it. But they make, or else the merchant does it for them, a rough calculation of what will need to be transported; and by doing so establish in advance the quantity of goods, they will have waiting for buyers. Generally speaking, at first manufacturers set out to satisfy one of the first needs of men, that of clothing. But, in other professions too, it was noticed that one could work faster and more economically in factories than according to some piecemeal order. Weavers, by always repeating the same operation, had become accustomed to do it with a readiness and a dexterity that other men could not match; that they had at the same time perfected their equipment; that they were working tirelessly, instead of wasting time waiting for some consumer orders; so that they were earning on the quantity, and that they could, therefore, do a work more cheaply by making it in advance, rather than if they waited for the order of buyers.

The merchants therefore began to establish manufacturing facilities for all kinds of goods that could in turn support a transportation system; and as the means of transport became faster and more economical, manufacturing replaced the ancient crafts more and more; a larger number of objects was prepared in advance, and not on a direct order from the consumer, but on his presumed disposition to buy. The advantage of the consumer did not figure into any of this, the manufacturing innovation was accomplished solely because it provided an advantage to the manufacturer.

The latter expected to benefit from all the savings that the application of perfected mechanical powers, large supplies of materials and an extensive supervision of the laboring force allowed him to produce. On the other hand however, the sale, the throughput of product, now had become a necessity to him; and that depended much more on the eventual consumer than on any skills of his own workers. Until their work was demanded, they were expected to live on whatever small savings were accumulated in the past; the manufacturer had spent all his savings on the preparation of new product. And so the need pressed him, he had to seduce the consumer, and for this purpose he was quick to abandon all the savings that he had been making while manufacturing.

We only put the class of manufacturers fourth in line, not only because its origin is posterior to that of the other three, but also because society can do without them much better than the skills of classes we have named before. Indeed, at the origin of society, all the work that manufacturers do today were carried out as family activities, with less economy no doubt, but also with the certainty that its output would not ever be useless, or that it would never be sold at a loss. Later, this same work was carried out by tradespeople, with just as much profit for the producers; only it cost the consumer less. Finally, a state that could be considered to be the most advanced in the world, this nation could still without regrets do without manufacturers, because all the other nations are eager to provide it with all the objects that can be factory prepared. In this case, the consumer instead is able to take advantage of all the savings that the manufacturer has made on employing unskilled people, though seeing it decrease a little by the greater costs of transport which are at his expense.

Consumers, as a whole, make up any nation; but, more specifically, the most important consumers are landowners and the cultivators, or indeed the two primitive classes; all the others have settled themselves in place to serve them, while at the same time they have made a commitment to serve those who serve them. The work of the manufacturers, in

the final analysis, is always paid to them with the sustenance that creates territorial wealth. It is the latter that satisfies the most imperious of their needs, and those who produce that form by far the greatest part of their consumers. It is of little importance to the sustenance producers whether the manufactured objects they are buying are domestically produced or foreign; the difference in price between the two may perhaps slightly affect their enjoyments, but it can never cause them suffering.

But it is suffering, and a very intense suffering indeed, that a manufacturer is exposed to, if the work, which he has done, does not find a flow. By preparing in advance the products of his industry, with which he wants to seduce buyers, he has no choice but to be well supplied, to be able to offer them his assortment of product. He therefore needs a surplus of goods, and he works tirelessly to prepare them, especially since any time lost is for

him a loss of revenue. So he uses all his savings, all his credit, as far as he can extend it, to buy the needed raw materials; and the inventory of goods that fill up his store not only represent the revenue on which he must live, but also the small fortune he had been accumulating, all the capital that he had borrowed on a fixed term, and on which he owes a return to lenders. Moreover, if he experiences a delay in the sale, not only is his subsistence taken away from him, but his honor is compromised. When the need really presses him, it is necessary that he sells, and that he sells at all costs. Thus he consents to lose first of all his revenue, then all his small capital, rather than not satisfying his creditors when due. He works therefore, he works with ardor, but, instead of creating wealth, he is dispelling it; because the finished merchandise is worth less now than the raw materials with which they were made it was worth, and never mind his machinery depreciation; thus the general fall in prices is a decrease in his fortune, and at the same time of the whole national fortune. But this state of suffering and ruin, this state of despair is not a rare accident for the manufacturer; on the contrary, it is a fate that only rarely won't await him, because it is the direct result of

176

his efforts. Indeed, each of the to be made advances, each of the scientific applications by which the manufacturer first replaced the hand loom, by which then a perfected manufacture replaced the manual carder, has had as its necessary effect: a throwing on the market of a supernumerary quantity of merchandise. The innovator, thanks to the progress he had made and with the reduction in price which was its consequence, counted on now being able to sell to the one who previously had bought wares from his competitor. The increase in the innovator's flow was called prosperity; and collectively, eyes were closed both to the ruin of competition and to the market congestion which resulted from it. But in this struggle, trying to succeed at the expense of others, just about everyone in turn becomes a ruined competitor, and a superabundance of goods is felt throughout the economy.

The more importance a manufacture acquires, the more the consumers for whom it is intended are unknown to the manufacturer: it is by conjecture that he has to evaluate their needs and their taste; but at the distance he finds himself from them, he always risks being misinformed, either in a decrease in those needs, or an increase in the means of rivals who try to cover them like him. The more a manufacture is important and his market distant, the more a possible congestion is unforeseeable and its effects more disastrous. Moreover, as the manufacturer's effort is determined only by the most pressing needs, this encumbrance does not stop him; on the contrary, he will have to redouble his efforts to produce, until an absolute ruin compels his idleness. As long as his wares sell well, he will be well paid, he lives in ease, he provides himself with good times; the pleasure most often preferred to all others is that of relaxation. But as soon as his goods encounter difficulties in selling, his revenue or profit decreases, and impelling him to react one way or another. To give up work would be to give up sustenance, and the more trouble he has disposing of his product,

the hungrier he gets. He will recognize well that there are too many hands involved providing the same kind of product as his, but far from coming to the conclusion that he must remain idle for one part of the day, he will seek to deserve the preference of

177

those who are in the market to buy, not only by being content with less reward for his product, but starting it earlier in the day, working harder at it, and ending it later.

The clutter is therefore much more formidable and directly affecting the manufacturer than for workers in general; misery is much more quickly bound to him, as is suffering and even death. No prudence in the world can avoid it, for it works over distant and unknown markets; and then there are also distant and unknown rivals, who, suddenly, and without being able to foresee it, come to supplant him in the market he used to occupy, in offering instead of his commodity a new one that costs less or that is worth more. When there are overabundant people in a place, like the disproportion between the demand for work and the available hands to carry it out; this can be neither very large nor very sudden, the craftsmen among them usually find a means to circumvent it by moving to a place where they are needed. As for the others, at least when they don't amount to many, they can be helped by public charity. But those employed in manufacturing find themselves all in one and the same place, far from those they are to serve. When they find themselves superabundant, it is very difficult for them to know where they should go. Most often, as the same clutter is acting up everywhere, they aren't welcome anywhere; everywhere there are too many of them, and, on the other hand, they are too numerous in the places where they find themselves for public charity to sufficiently provide for their needs. Also their sufferings are horrible; they endanger public health, safety, and morality, are also endangered, and these can be pointed out as the greatest of calamities which, in modern times, governments are called upon to mitigate.

But if the danger of excess production is infinitely more formidable for manufacturers than for tradespeople, the danger of a production defect is hardly ever noticeable. Everything that will be lacking on the market, but which can be made in the factory, will very quickly be replaced by foreign

178

trade. Consumers will hardly notice the slight price difference through which all that they will ever need, will have been brought from the ends of the earth. So we will repeat with much more reason still for fabricators and manufacturers, that what we said about tradespeople is that if society can exercise some vigilance in regard to them, it must above all aim to prevent their number from multiplying beyond needs.

We have reviewed the various trades performing the manual work that a society needs for its subsistence and its pleasures. Above them all rises another class of men, who do not work with their hands but with their

intelligence, which is directing all the others in their efforts, in order to protect them, instruct them, and lead them towards the common goal, who finally perform in society roughly the functions of the general staff in an army. This class is divided again into hundreds of different professions; and all provide leverage to society, because all of them can be considered to relate to social happiness. Among these workers of intelligence, some would be active in the offices of government, and their function must be to direct the efforts of all towards the greatest benefit for all; others take it to be their special responsibility to develop the progress of intelligence and morality in the nation, and to lead it towards a greater perfection: for this purpose, some would be responsible for the education of the young and adolescents, others for religious education, which is a special education for all ages. A large number of them are devoted to defending the interests of society, or of the individuals who make it up; they are the opponents of all kinds of disorder; they study or practice the art of war in all its aspects to guarantee public peace; or they are the guardians of health, as doctors, or of property, as lawyers. Many others finally take care of executing the direction of all the material works which are accomplished by the other classes. Within this category capitalists would fall, who provide the funds necessary to perform the work; entrepreneurs owning

179

factories or workshops with all their inspectors and assistants, who lead by their intelligence and vigilance; the merchants, who send the manufactured products they bought to another class or country; scientists, who discover the laws of nature, and the engineers and mechanics, who apply these laws to all human work.

Despite the infinite variety of professions shared between these men of intelligence, a common glory attaches itself to all of them: it is what made human nature develop to the highest degree of which it is susceptible. They are the ones who made its moral and intellectual power grow, and this beneficent influence extends not only to individuals who belong to these herewith identified professions, but also to those who make a living from manual work. The latter, in fact, are enlightened by the reflection of the light that men of intelligence sheds on them. Glory, like the guarantee of society, is found in its men of intelligence, and economic policy must regard their production and improvement as one of its special aims; as one of the most happy results of a good government, inspired by the rules of the household and community. It is only through conjunctive efforts and guarantees that a weak creature, dependent and tormented by needs like man, in a well-organized society, has been able to raise its creativity to such a high level. But if the development of intelligences is the noblest goal that human societies can set for themselves, when one comes to regard this development no longer as a goal; but as a means, by which only a fortune is sought by those who obtained it; the intelligent class of men can, just as well as any other, see itself threatened with congestion. Moreover, this class experiences today, almost everywhere, the suffering that results from being too numerous for the task it has to accomplish.

There is no country where one does not complain that there are no longer careers to be made for young people. We can still remember a time when a man who had received

180

the education that could be obtained in all good colleges, without even having distinguished himself there, was sure to make his way, provided he showed assiduity and good will. If even this young man was destined for commerce or manufactures, these two qualities alone were sufficient for him; even though his intelligence might well have been limited, and that his education was limited almost solely to knowing how to read, write, and calculate.

But today the parents who intend their children to become businessmen, feel the need to have them acquire a wide variety of knowledge; even after having given them a special education deemed suitable for an enlightened businessman. They need established credit and referrals for introducing them to trading posts, where at all but a small salary is assured to them, and where they rarely see before them some hope of advancement. Higher education does not give young people better guarantees that they can make their way in the world. Each year, schools of theology, law, and medicine, bring a crowd of young men to the entrance of the temple of these three literate professions, and there begins, and which is constantly renewed, a discouraging struggle to make a mark there; sometimes a talent succeeds in distinguishing himself, but often they fail, and the students are also all convinced that it was useless having sent them there. A larger crowd still incessantly besieges ministries and all such avenues of power to solicit positions; but there are no places to occupy for half of those who would be capable of filling them. The poverty of scholars and poets has long been proverbial; maybe nowadays it has decreased a little, because of the jobs that the daily press is offering to men to fill their opinion pages; however, for them also the number of untapped talents far surpasses the number of jobs. Those who observe the bookstore business soon realize that more is being written than is read; that serious works are bought more because of vanity than out of desire for instruction, and that libraries are rather

181

elegant pieces of furniture, with which the rich like to adorn their place of living, rather than instrumental for profound studies.

Clutter will soon be felt in the bookstores more than in any other kind of business, because books, instead of being consumed and thus disappear like other commodities, accumulate in the hands of the buyers themselves. So society, if it can exercise some vigilance on the class which lives by its intelligence, must try to prevent, for it as for all the other occupations, that it grows to exceed beyond need. The sufferings of the men of intelligence, when they lack bread, are indeed more stinging than those of any other order of men. Their education has constantly tended to develop their taste, their delicacy, their sensitivity, and consequently their susceptibility to

suffering. They form the aristocracy of the spirit, and while this at times has given rise to belittling all the other occupations, it cannot renounce being itself distinguished; the pride of those who have received a higher education, makes them sense every kind of humiliation, every kind of dependence, as especially painful. Their bodily functions do no longer allow them to shift from intellectual work to that of physical work. But if, in their misery, they suffer more than others, they are also, in their suffering, going to be much more dangerous for society than others; they have the power to incite and lead the masses; and they will be eager to attack a social-order environment in which they have not found a place; and they have shown already to have more skill, than all others combined, to overthrow it.

Those who exercise power in absolute governments, that is to say in all those who resist social progress, are well aware of this fact, and they are watching with extreme jealousy all candidates for the literate professions. But we cannot note without sadness that this enmity for the enlightenment today is gaining the support of the mass of citizens, who see in students, young lawyers, journalists, constant enemies of their peace and quiet. However, the most virtuous friends of mankind are at the same time sounding their voices to endlessly ask for

182

the instruction of the people through a proper education. They consider the founding of schools as the most powerful antidote to the evils that afflict humanity; and they believe that the advances in popular intelligence will not only calm the passions, but support the needs of the people too.

To explain such contradictory wishes, to get a more accurate idea of what can really be expected from the progress of enlightenment, we first need to make a distinction; we must consider education as a goal, but it must also be considered as a means. If we look at it as a goal, the progress of human intelligence must be the first of our wishes; if we look at it as a means, an education destined to lead to fortune seeking, and given to too many men who need to be successful at it, will instead lead them to misery, and the State to a revolution.

Man was destined by his Creator to be progress seeking; and the noblest, the most desirable of this progress is that of his intelligence, understanding under this name all the immaterial parts of his being. Any education that at the same time will embrace the whole nation, the classes intended to do manual work like all the others; any education that to all will give a more in-depth knowledge of their duties, a more correct idea of a relationship with God and with one's fellow men, a higher sense of his moral dignity, a more constant disposition to benevolence; any education that will develop at the same time both the imagination and the sensibilities, which will thus prepare more enhanced pleasures for more sensitive beings; and finally, any education which will make the material world better known, in the midst of which all should live, will be of great benefit to all humanity, a benefit in accordance with the plan of God towards it.

But an education given to the poor classes, who are having a need for

work to exist, when it will aim to take them out of their state; education which will be represented to them as a means of giving up manual work, to rise to fortune by the labors of intelligence,

183

deceive those to whom it is given, and cause them more suffering than well-being. It is only a deceiving charity of the one who proposes to raise men from the class of manual laborers to the class of laborers of the mind. No society can exist without the work carried out by physical means. If we call on a lot of peasants to leave the growing fields to enter medicine, law, or theological schools, it will yet be necessary to recall them or to cultivate the fields they will have abandoned; or rather it will be necessary that they be born, in the families of cultivators from which they will have emerged, more children to hold on to their place; for society cannot survive if the ranks of the cultivators are not filled. Peasants won't be made happy by offering a few of them a Distinguished-Ranks Lottery Ticket. The same goes for the urban trades and factories. Public education may well make it so that a son of a blacksmith or a factory worker can distinguish himself in a literate profession; but nonetheless, his place must be filled by another blacksmith, another factory worker. It will be necessary however for the manual labor of society to be carried out, for society's material needs to be met.

Perhaps we will draw objections that by speaking thus, we seem to take no account of the progress of mechanics, and the ready application of all the sciences to the industrial arts. The hope of the human race, we will be told, is precisely to discover in science a means of dispensing man from all his physical work, and to leave it dedicated entirely to meditation and to the development of one's intelligence. Already, by ingenious discoveries, we managed to cultivate the fields with half, with a quarter of the pairs of hands that were used there not so long ago. In England, where agriculture is so prosperous, one not count more than twenty cultivators per square mile, while in Italy one needs at least two hundred. Can't we hope that by means of the progress in the industrial arts we will succeed in dispensing the remaining twenty who now still have work to do? Scientific powers are even more effective in factories.

184

This is where steam engines replace humans, with a singular advantage. By their help a single worker, a child even, does a work that a hundred men could not hope to accomplish formerly; why wouldn't we hope this only worker will be able to rest in his turn, that at least the child will be able to suffice, and that between thirty and forty years every grown man will be dismissed from every factory, as is it already today for the cotton factory? All the work of the fields, all that of the cities will be done one day by this gigantic and blind power that the knowledge of man has been enslaving himself to. It is therefore essential to open all parts of higher education to prepare the millions and millions of men who were hitherto

used in such a degrading manner by doing manual work, for the literate professions. – We are conceptually posing, how the progress that we are told will take from these millions of men their current livelihood, and, to imagine that they will find some new one in the literate professions; one must have forgotten that the various classes of society are all mutually dependent on each other. If the men of labor feed, clothe, and house the nation, the men of intellectual pursuits are in their turn intended to guard, direct, enlighten, and heal, the men of sorrow. When we have reduced the number of working men to a quarter or a fifth of what it is now, we will need for them only a quarter or one-fifth of priests, lawyers, doctors and all other members of the literate professions that are employed today. When we have cut them off altogether, we might as well do without the human race. Strange system that one that considers it to be a progress in the arts to cut men off their livelihood, sometimes in one occupation and sometimes in another; which confiscates them everywhere for the benefit of things, while telling us about the achieved increase in wealth, when we no longer can feed the nation sufficiently as before! What we believe is that it's all to deceive the poor, and to prepare them for a miserable existence; to call them to leave the plow or hammer for school benches, by

185

telling them that this is the path to fortune. In no way does this mean that the door to science must be closed to them; we must not deprive society of the eminent talents that can emerge among the lower classes, and which in turn will shed their light on all men. One should be proud however, of the natural energy in men of genius; it will make them enthusiastic and grow, overcoming all obstacles, without the need to go get them from abroad. Moreover, the more we take care of the education of a people who intend to remain living as they are, the more genius will find the means to emerge from the midst of its ranks. There is no harm in the obstacles he will have to overcome even if formidable. On the other hand, it is mediocre talents that need to be discouraged from a career that would lead to the greatest number of them finding themselves in a state of shame, struggle, and pain. By arousing in men who have to make a living from manual work the desire to change their condition, they would then only become dissatisfied with their own, which however must yet be fulfilled, and the anxiety that they would be working under would harm their happiness just as much as the rest of society. Let us now summarize our observations on the cooperation of all classes of society to create wealth through work, and on the sharing of this wealth among all these classes, to keep them all equally in a state of prosperity. This is what we have called the economic organization of human society, and what we propose for the purpose of the economist's meditations and their efforts to convince statesmen. The word wealth, like the word prosperity, just like the word happiness, is meaningless, if we do not relate it to the person enjoying it. We consider the science of finance as a way to enrich a sovereignty; we could conceive

there to be a science of self-enrichment, and that this nameless science is studied by countless students; but we do know for certain what the science of enriching, or chrematistics, the science of wealth, taken abstractly, is all about. We conceive however, that the wealth of a society is nothing but the participation of all

186

its members in the material advantages that work has given rise to. In our eyes, men take on reciprocal duties in human associations only because of their expectations from these mutually beneficial associations. They appeared from the hands of their Creator, as free, independent, and endowed with faculties, if not equal, then at least of equal nature. Driven by the same desire for conservation, the same desire for happiness, they believed to find the guarantee to these in associating with the rules of the household and the community. Any such association could not function but by a subordination to its rules; but it could not be legitimized other than by its goal – the common good. The idea of this common good rises high enough above the individual to inspire this individual at times to self-sacrifice, even to heroism; but a heroism that is awakened only by the feeling of duty, and duty, a noble distinction of the intelligent and moral being, includes always in itself the retentivity of a right, the feeling of a needing to exist reciprocity.

Men can only see themselves as being truly associates, in as much as they have given their conscious assent to the association; because they have recognized that, even in their humblest condition, they are protected by it. As long as there is a reciprocity of benefits, men have incurred obligations towards the social order: if reciprocity is incomplete, they are subjects; if it is equal, they are citizens; but if there is no reciprocity, if those who obey are slaves, if their reciprocal advantage is not understood as valid only as a general advantage and not an individual one, they have not been taking on any obligation. The violence they experience has put them outside the law, suspended their rights, and exempted them from duty. This reciprocity of benefits is the basis of political economy, as it is that of public and constitutional law.

As well as to carefully raise the political edifice in the nation, we must study how each order in society, each power that it organizes or that it recognizes, contributes to the common good, and receives in return from all others the support and the guarantee which will preserve its existence; thus, when we want to provide for subsistence and enjoyment

187

that work gives rise to, we must study how each of the conditions, each of the occupations that were formed by the division of human labor, and that society found existing, or that it wants to be, contributes to the subsistence and to the enjoyments of all others; how it in turn finds the guarantee of its subsistence and its pleasures, and how finally, mutual competition gives rise to happiness or rather the well-being of all.

The material well-being of the whole population, these benefits are known to us by the name of wealth, distributed in such a way so that all classes of the nation benefit, always suppose a certain relation between the increase of the population and that of subsistence to exist. Mr. Malthus' book on the principle of population produced a revolution in science. Several rejected his proposals as being too pessimistic, or found it more convenient to deny them than to grieve over it; others have been able, with more reason, to criticize some propositions of Malthus as being too absolute, by showing that food supplies can always occur faster than a population can increase, and make people feel that it is the proportion between the population and the social revenue that determines either ease or misery. But an important fact has always been emerging from Malthus' research, a fact that no one can deny without voluntarily closing his eyes to the evidence, and that is that a population can grow too quickly relative to its means of subsistence, and that this disproportionate increase is the greatest calamity to which nations can be exposed. Another fact equally indisputable has resulted from the researches of Malthus, and of all those that have been done since on the same subject, it is that the human species has such a great tendency to increase and to multiply, as soon as new working opportunities appear. By this fact alone, a substantial number of individuals ready for making their own way in life become created. As soon as a livelihood is presented, there will be men who will abuse the situation. Only prudence, or outright misery, will stop parents in excessively increasing their families. However quickly we sometimes see a population

188

grow, it would be growing even faster, if the rich or the poor never thought about the deprivations to which the birth of more children would expose them. The offer of a new livelihood will temporarily make the poor forget these deprivations; this being the reason for an immediate increase in the population then.

These facts are admitted by all who recently wrote on political economy; but it is strange to see how in the application they took little account of it. They have said, in fact, that the poor had to be taught 'moral constraint', which must make him repress his passions, delay their marriages, refrain from having more children than he can raise in the abundance of necessary things; and they announced that they would arrive at this happy result by giving the people a higher education. But they, who received this higher education; they, the philosophers who organize society, who calculate production and consumption, they only thought of further increasing the disproportion between one and the other. They want the farmer to harvest more wheat from his fields, the fabricator more fabric from his workmen; but it is not so that there are ever greater numbers of manufacturers, and that each of them for their part already has more food and more clothes? Quite the contrary, they are teaching how to do without men, both in the fields and in the city, and how one can feed and clothe more economically those who they are forced to keep on.

We have considered the science of political economics and the duty of the

legislator differently. We sought to determine what were the necessary classes for each other, and what welfare was required for each class; we wondered, not how one could be removed or diminished, but how one could maintain them all in abundance; and remembering that all run the same danger of an exuberant population, we have asked that social power watch over all, not to prevent them from growing, but to ensure,

189

if possible, that all of them grow only according to certain rules and in a wise proportion.

Addressing first the farmers, we would tell them that their occupation is always the one in which excessive men, jobs, and products, inherently are least likely to leads to dangerous situations; that, however, they too are marching towards certain ruin, if they try to market foodstuffs for which there is no consumer demand, whether they could pay for them or not. A farming industry does not necessarily dependent on commerce; while working for themselves and for their families, market prices don't matter to them. If they work only for nearby towns, they can still easily get to know what the local needs are and satisfy them. An ordinary prudence will suffice to not find themselves burdened with foodstuffs that could not be sold. But the more markets expand, the more for instance the wheat trade grows, the more impossible it becomes to know the needs of customers and the quantity of resources from suppliers that need to be advanced; the more the value of products, as the most important of all, is subject to the hazardous game of commerce, which, at the first appearing encumbrance, can reduce prices much below already expended costs. So we believe that the State, for its safety, must ensure that the greater part of the national product reaches the consumer without being subject to the chances of commerce. With this goal in mind, we have expressed the desire that the greater part of farmers are owners; not giving rise to commodities because of speculation, but in proportion to heir own needs; that they do not marry, nor marry off their children, until a subsistence is assured; and finally, that agriculture and population, whether they are growing, stationary, or even backsliding, always walk at the same pace, because suffering results from a disproportion between the two.

We then showed how non-cultivating owners, like the aristocracy of the countryside, was useful to society, and we suggested that society keep it in

190

the proper proportion. This class as a whole does not run, like the others, the danger of becoming too poor, but, on the contrary, that of becoming too rich; that is to say that the number of country gentlemen diminishes as their heritages combine, or as they successively buy goods that were to be shared among other cultivators. Recalling the purpose of their existence, we have pointed out the double danger against which society must be on guard against them.

We now come to those whose industrial output is necessarily an object of exchange, and who therefore live off commercial wealth. The first are the tradespeople, who bring their services to the market rather than products of their industry. We showed how much their existence is necessary for society; how much, in return, the latter is required to reward them fairly. They will only be fairly rewarded as long as they are in no way exposed to ruinous competition. Their interest and that of society also require that their number does not increase beyond the point which is necessary to do the work that may be asked of them, and that their establishment is always close to those who employ them, so that the proportion between their number and the work required is always easy to grasp.

The next class, that of fabricators and manufacturers, exists only through commerce and for the sake of commerce. Established at great distances from those whom they are to serve, producing to satisfy needs of which they do not know the extent, it is impossible for them to manage precisely the quantity of work that will be consumed; they are therefore obliged to rely on competition, to work in the hope that they will be preferred over their rivals. They create wealth too, as long as they meet existing needs; they destroy it, on the contrary, as soon as they produce an overabundance, a market congestion that lowers prices. For to manufacture is not to create, it is to change one substance into another; if they lose on this commercial exchange instead of there being

191

a gain of wealth, the more they produce, the more wealth they destroy. But the transition from the creative industry to the ruinous industry is happening so furtively, that they themselves cannot recognize it. There is moreover, in the rivalry of their workshops, in the practice of 'under-selling', in the hope of supplanting each other, and of ruining each other, something anti-social, which makes the introduction of this kind of industry singularly formidable. We won't, however, warn society not to tolerate it; for it is often the consequence of the irresistible march of the human spirit and the domination of man over nature. But we will tell the government to always look on the spirited progress of manufacturing with suspicion; to remember that regardless how dazzling the prosperity of a modern manufacture in its new home is, this prosperity is almost always offset by the misery and ruin of another industry at the other end of its sector. That this prosperity is still, by its very nature, short term; because another one is bound to arise, in turn taking away its market, just as it removed that of the industries having preceded it; and that finally, no misery equals that of a decadent factory, and that society, required to protect all its offspring, must think in advance of the sacrifices it will have to make when a calamity hits its manufacturers.

So, it should not hesitate to come to their help at anytime, because most often it did not depend on them to avoid their fate; and, although judging things from above, one can accuse their principle, competition, as being antisocial, they themselves never had that feeling, and neither did any moralist warn them, so that their conduct is free from blame.

And, finally, the last, or better said, the highest class of society, the one that lives off the work of intelligence, is no stranger to commercial wealth; since its works are objects of exchange also, having only an exchangeable value in as much as they do indeed find something to exchange them for. We believe in the need to reminding, that there is danger and suffering for the intelligentsia, if their increase in number is too

192

fast, and if it is disproportionate to the needs of the other classes. Accordingly, we ask that society takes care that the intelligence of all is developed, in proportion to the state in which each must dwell; that public education becomes implemented to make all citizens happy, perfected and perfectible in their condition. But we also need to stress that the poor not be encouraged to strive to change their condition through the works of the mind; that one is received in the welcoming ranks of men of intelligence, when standing out and one rises to them on one's own, but that no one be picked up and be brought in; because the competition there is already so great that instead of making him happy, he would probably be subjected to more intense suffering.

We have proposed few means of implementation to achieve the desired goal; but we believe we have done a lot by putting this goal clearly in front of the eyes. This goal is abundance assured to the human species, by foremost ensuring the employment of useful human labor; clutter however renders some of this work useless, and impoverishes society all the more; this goal is to discover suitable proportions between all the conditions of society, so that they can support each other effectively; this goal is that a fair proportion between activities and pleasures for each individual is assured; and finally, this goal is the ease of all, ease that consumes and destroys, at the same rate as it creates. Whereas while producing we do not yet know how great an increase in material wealth is achieved, an increase that society would obtain by producing more and consuming less it is not; because as soon as commercial wealth has been accumulated, it becomes congestion, and value is lost.

FOURTEENTH ESSAY

How Manufactures Contribute to National Happiness.

All the works of men, or all the products of their works, can in their turn become objects of exchange, such as we sought to make clear in the previous Essay. All then, in principle, participate more or less in the nature of commercial wealth, and their value ceases to be proportionate, either to the trouble they cost, or to the usefulness of which they may be, to settle only on what we can be obtained in return. Commercial value in exchange then obscures any other value. It is only in an advanced period of society however, that the products of agriculture, the products of the urban trades, even the products of the intelligentsia, are all intended to be exchanged. But in fact they all predate commercial exchanges, they could be obtained without such trades, and often they still are. The products of manufactures however, are born of trade and are intended only for trade. We have, in fact, regarded as the distinctive character of the manufacture, to prepare goods capable of transport, without, as a final destination, being previously requested; and then deliver them to the store, for a distribution to wherever they are needed and requested. That is why, when we take into consideration the commercial wealth especially, our first attention should be drawn to factories.

It is also in this way that philosophers, writers, and almost all the agencies of public opinion understand it, when they ask the government to protect, to encourage the industry; for all of them, industry is essentially identical to manufacturing. Our era is called that of industrialism, because it is now that manufactures have acquired their greatest developments. Yet nobody seems to question whether progress in manufacturing indeed is a sure sign of national prosperity; we believe however, that the very sufferings society is experiencing today invites us to take up that question from above. What are the reasons which should, among all the branches of industry, induce a government to favor manufactures? What are these sure benefits of their progress for consumers, what benefits for producers; and what, if any, dangers are there attached to their development?

We have already indicated that we do not share this zeal, which seems to exist universally, for industrialism. We have been ranking it very low, in the appreciation of what forms the wealth, strength, and happiness of a nation. Those factories which are considered today as the most beautiful development of man's genius; these businesses have been celebrated as the agent of universal civilization; this influx of foreign demand; and all these exports, that we have proclaimed as so many victories over rivals. We do not intend to depreciate any of man's efforts or of his successes, however; especially since we are somewhat embarrassed, in a matter so serious, so

intimately linked to general happiness, to be holding a position in support of paradoxical opinions, of any desire to amaze with their novelty. We recognize that the manufactures, in their current development, present us with a series of victories, that man, by his intelligence, has won over matter; we agree that commerce has spread a new moral influence over the whole world, that it has spread knowledge far and wide, that it tightened the bonds of brotherhood between men of various races. But blind

195

admiration for one of the developments of human power must not prevent us from properly appreciating the various social circumstances which are accompanying it, of indicating the relationship of one with the other, and of bringing attention to the ultimate purpose of human association within society. The latter, in fact, is not a method to set out to discover how men could accomplish things, but how things would serve men.

One should be on one's guard against a disposition common to all men, and which often makes them illusional. They feel their own weaknesses and their helplessness so acutely, that they cannot see disproportionate effects with this weakness without abandoning themselves to enthusiasm. Anything that bears a character of greatness and power is sure to get their admiration, even though sometimes this greatness is exercised at the very expense of the one who admires. The extraordinary will and the power of a tyrant strike his subjects with an involuntary respect, however dangerous it may be for the human race not to limit this will, however unreasonable the use of this power is; but the witnesses who admire them are struck only by the contrast between the weakness of their own as individuals, and the force he exerts on millions. We have often heard subjects boasting that their monarch was absolute, that he could dispose of their property and of their lives, and that he didn't even have to take into consideration any of their own admonitions. Perhaps the thrones of the despots of Asia owe their stability only to the admiration of their subjects for a human will that nothing can resist. Monuments produced by this will perhaps excite still more admiration, because we see it imprinted solely in their greatness, not in the suffering of those who executed them.

The pyramids of Egypt have been collecting for four thousand years the admiration of all successive generations, although they possess neither a beauty nor utility; it is only because they are monuments, which seem to be eternal, as a triumph of one of the most weak among beings, over the immense forces of nature.

196

Since this feeling uplifts man, and increases his self-confidence, no doubt, like all natural feelings, it has its uses. Enthusiasm, even if unreasonable, always has something noble about it, but we must not surrender to it until the point of being blinded by it; and above all, one should never entrust to enthusiasm the conduct, nor the destiny of nations.

It shouldn't be expected, but political economy has often strayed in search

of the great rather than useful. So, for example, the imagination has been flattered by this lofty thought of commerce which connects the ends of the land, which brings together the most remote regions to satisfy the needs or the tastes of even the most humble individual; which induces one into the making of adventurous expeditions, to the most formidable climates, on the most stormy seas, among the most barbaric peoples, to serve unknown consumers. Never denying our admiration for what carries a character of grandeur; such is commerce, as in its mind the universe is embraced, and in its entrepreneurial spirit its dangers are defied; but let's not conclude in any way that trade is all the more useful as it extends farther afield; on the contrary, it is never more advantageous than when it is door to door, or between town and countryside. We still see every day that the imagination is flattered by an appearance of grandeur in the enterprise of serving man, by the vast extent of single-merchant shops, where before one's eyes all the riches which can flatter one's tastes are gathered, exciting anyone's desires; by the order and regularity that a single works manager maintains among hundreds of workers, when he makes them all contribute to the execution of his thought; by the extent and opulence of the buildings of a vast farm, where many herds are brought in, and around which fields as far as the eye can see are subjected to a single cultivation system. We do not deny the beauty, the grandeur of these various aspects, but it is the beauty of things and not that of men.

We consistently have been asking economists to bring their gaze back to man, to reason as to what promises man the

197

most happiness; either a single store where an opulent merchant brings together all the treasures of the world, or hundreds of modest shops, each of which supports an independent household; to judge whether all those pairs of hands, which carry out the thought of a single head develop as much human intelligence, as if these obeyed so many heads which as a matter of course practice combining and reflecting; to finally count if the opulent farm which covers a square mile in extent will produce as many brave soldiers for a country, as forty rustic farm houses, belonging to as many peasant owners, ready to defend the laws of the land that is making everyone happy.

This same admiration for any development of human power of man has aroused much of the same enthusiasm with which we celebrated the recent progress of manufactures. Among the victories that man has won over matter, there are indeed few more admirable than those due to the fruitful application of science to the industrial arts. The man who, by himself, felt weak, requested strength from everything which, in nature, seemed to him to possess it. He recognized an active power in the falling waters, in the breath of winds, and he began by mastering these preexisting movements; he forced them to obey in order to perform a kind of human-like work. But soon the genius of man made him discover some sort of latent force, that he could at will either create or suspend by the application of the laws of matter, which he could excite in any place and increase almost limitless.

He initiated some movements with gravity; then the expansive force of water vapor was seized upon, submitting this to his will better than either water or the wind. And while the indefatigable power of this blind agent does not ask for any rest, the engineer directing it endowed it almost with intelligence and skill. Without a doubt man can rightly be proud of the empire he has exerted on nature, and of all the human-like work which he has forced it to accomplish; but neither the strength he borrowed from the elements, nor the skill with which he exercises them, are evidence that it has resulted in a greater good for society.

198

The human being has become more powerful, but will his power be exercised for or against his fellow men? Will it only offer the happiness and perfection of one in a thousand individuals, or the happiness and perfection of all, as the political economist must desire? If such a great development of power has actually produced a social good, that good must be in proportion to its cause, and it should obviously strike everyone's eyes as such. One cannot help, on the contrary, but to wonder with amazement how such a prodigious progress in the industrial arts has not changed the fate of the human species more. In the last sixty years, we have acquired a domination over nature which our ancestors could not even dream about; we forced matter to obey us and to take the forms we want; and sometimes we do in a day what, in the times of ancient civilizations, would not have seemed possible to do in a year. How does it happen that this prodigious power exerted on things leaves so few monuments? If in a thousand years from now, a philosophical observer roamed the regions over which the peoples of Europe will have passed, it is likely that he would be hit even more by the remains that he would find from the power exerted on matter by the Greeks, by the Romans, even by our barbarian ancestors, than by us. It may be true that to us belongs the art of moving some of the heaviest burdens, that of making the elements obey, that of intelligently subduing raw materials; however the stone sculpture that breathes, as if driven by feeling, modeling itself under the chisel of the Greeks; the Pantheon, the Coliseum, the Baths, having triumphed over the elements that conjured against them, are the work of the Romans, and the temple which lifts its bold spires, was built by our ancestors at a time which we call barbarian. Our age, however, has in turn undertaken gigantic city fortifications, main roads, navigation channels, the railways, all having come into being thanks to an almost infinite number of applied arms, the use of immense

199

capital, from a conception of high intelligence. But almost always we refuse to impart our greatest works the character and duration; it is quite possible that of those we just indicated none still exists in a hundred years. We calculate the utility too accurately to care about leaving any lasting impression to our descendants; we have only ourselves in view, and we would hardly make an effort or sacrifice to extend the life of any of our

monuments after the extinction of the generation that raised them. Our ancestors did not forget their posterity as much as we do; their power over nature was limited, but as it was they left us results. By them the land was cleared and fertilized, enclosed, and irrigation and drainage canals were dug; by them palaces and stately homes were built, not as in England, on a hundred-year lease and to be demolished at the end of which, but so as to last several centuries, and to still provide one of the great comforts of life, and a spacious accommodation, to those who are no longer rich enough to build one like it.

It is not, in fact, our public monuments that the panegyrists of our own century are proud of; it is less yet of what we do for posterity. We rather hold as a maxim that each century should think of itself. Our triumphs, it is said, lie in the useful arts; all our social organization has been directed towards their improvement. But, economists excepted, the public has a singularly low regard for these useful arts, in their appreciation of a certain happiness for themselves. We have often heard a comparison of the civil life of the peoples of antiquity with our own: but no one ever claimed that we are happier than them, because we are wearing stockings and shirts made of cotton; although the loom and the spinning wheel, to which we owe both, are presented as two of the most prodigious industrial advances of our century. The effect of the fine arts on the mind, on the imagination of the ancients, is appreciated by philosophers; their masterpieces seem to ennoble our very nature;

200

but the effect of useful arts has always been counted for nothing, because we feel, without even thinking about it, that the most beautiful fabric from another century replaced in all respects, and of utility and enjoyment, the finest fabrics nowadays, although ours is produced by processes infinitely more ingenious.

Perhaps, it will be said, that in fact the useful arts do not have the pretense to develop imagination, sensitivity or taste, such as the fine arts; nor should they be judged as a charity; that they are intended for ourselves and not for our posterity; that their merit is the same as their name already indicates, of being useful, and that merit cannot be challenged in any way. The useful arts: this name recalls, in fact, that they are devoted to the uses of man; they must serve his conveniences, they must spread ease over all his habits, they must make use of their usefulness all the conditions of life. Is this what they indeed do? Does the ease of a country increase with its industry? Do we see the poor man's house better stocked?

In proportion to what the nation to which he belongs to produces more, is his wardrobe more substantial, the provisions of all kinds under his roof more abundant?

Do we see the worker's working hours shortened, his efforts leading to less tired muscles, less monotonous and less boring work, his rest more tranquil; all in proportion to what the wind, the waterfall, or steam, have done to increase the output of his work? Past times can of course no longer be inspected; but we can travel to our neighbors, less industrious, which as

they say, are less advanced. And when we do so, in some parts of Europe, we find this abundance of all the usual things under the most rustic roof, this rest, this contentment, these habits of relaxation or popular joy, not in those countries which pass for the most industrious. Instead we encounter charm oozing out of this confident abundance, this primitive hospitality, of this sweet relaxation assuaging a varied work; this charm, that so many travelers go to seek in the mountains of the more remote Swiss cantons,

201

disappears as soon as the factory makes its influence felt.

We will however, not dispute the name 'useful' in the arts; but the useful arts are as such divided into two branches – the trades and manufactures. In the trades, formerly the craftsmen, always ready to accomplish the work that consumers demanded of them, in return for the advances that these consumers made them, fully met the goal of utility, even though their economy may have been limited. Thus, in the first of the useful arts, baking – the bread was baked on behalf of each individual, by using public furnaces, which exercised a trade. Today, bread is prepared by bakers who, doing it on their own account and selling it to the public, are carrying out a simple manufacture.

In the countries which have preserved the old habits the most, many of the useful arts are still practiced, such as using a bakery with common ovens. The farmer sends his hides to the tanner; his wife, spun hemp or wool to the weaver; all the work is done on a consumer's account. There is no chance of any part of this work running into clutter, or risking a loss in its price, because you can't find it for sale somewhere. This method, as said before, is less economical; but, on the other hand, it never runs the risk of confusing mercantile profit with the hazardous profit causing losses elsewhere in the real economy of manufacturing, among manufacturers. Scientific processes, the wonders of the industrial arts, could after all find their application in the craft trades as well as in factories; and there are indeed countries where fairly complicated equipment is used on account of its consumers, as once the common ovens and common presses were used, either for grain or for oil. The difference between these two methods lies in the lower prices that they can be obtained for. But is it appropriate to lower the prices of all industrial products, all those of agriculture, or rather in what case is this lowering of prices a

202

gain to society and in when is it a loss? To pose the question in this way is already leaving aside things, and to think in terms of what this means in regard to men; it is to recognize that it is necessary to deal with prices in their relationship with the consumer, and in their relationship with the producer; it is a commitment to appreciate with accuracy the advantages that the low price and the abundance will bring to the first, as well as the sufferings that these same causes may make the second experience.

The products of labor are always intended to satisfy human demands; but these abstract words, the demands of man, the demand of society, a market demand, delude us, because they represent as an identical thing certain desires that are as different in their intensity as they are in their object. Likewise, the denomination of 'useful arts' deludes us by giving the same identical character to the arts, some of which satisfy the primal necessities of life, others only of its last superfluities.

The first demands of humans in society necessitates men to work, so as to meet their needs; which is compelling, because without this need satisfied, there is no more life. As long as it is about these same needs, regardless how painful the work is, it is less so than the deprivation of its products would be. The request of a society is then imperative; the work must be done. But after the satisfaction of needs come the pleasures; and these are not all of the same nature. There are some so purified, or so delicate, that they help to ennoble, not only the one who indulges personally in them, but to the whole human race who might, at some time, participate in them; such as those sometimes provided in the fine arts. There are others, so fleeting, so futile, or so corrupting, that one blushes to think of the human sweats as the price at which they were purchased. Perhaps society should desire the former, rather than actually desire all possible pleasures; this is so because not society as a whole, but only a few of its members desire the second. It is often even so that no one has any particular desire, for it is the invention of the producer that first

203

arouses the taste before satisfying it. The wonders of the fine arts not only adorned Athens, they also made the Athenians the most delicate, the most elegant, the most refined people that ever existed; so these had benefits for society as a whole. Society however, did not have any understanding of this in advance, and so could not have them strongly requested. The luxury items that now adorn the homes of the rich were not in demand by society as a whole, but only by a small class. The trinkets of fashion are neither requested by anyone; it is necessary for the thing to exist to give birth to a fantasy.

In order to produce the wheat on which the whole society must feed, the plowman must submit at dawn until the evening to a most tiring work; may he brave the ardor of the summers and the harshness of the frost, let him overcome his reluctance to spread fertilizing manure on the fields. It is even necessary that, to accomplish day after day his task outdoors, he develops his bodily faculties to the detriment of his intellectual ones; that, simultaneously he renounces in part the perfection of what is most noble in him, his intelligence and his sensitivities. In those climates where the subsistence fund of man is assured, not by wheat, but by rice; to cultivate it, he must also sacrifice his health, and expose his life to danger. So it is therefore at an infinitely high price that society buys its subsistence; but, is it paying too much for the thing it buys this way? Not probably, because it is life, and everyone's life. Society's request in this case is a compelling and irresistible order.

However man, after having obtained his sustenance at this price, and after having been given a price no lower for his clothing and lodging, which are almost as necessary to him, desires something else still; but he no longer wishes it with the same ardor, for he can do without the thing he desires, without deprivation costing him his life, or even his ease.

He wants more exquisite food, more elegant accommodation, furnishings, and clothes; his ideals move upward from desire to desire, from whim to whim, to the point of asking for

204

betterments so frivolous in all things accomplished by the works of man, that their very designation becomes ridiculous. Will he buy them at the same price he was buying the bread or rice needed to satisfy their hunger? Doubtlessly no, if it was the same man who felt the desire and who had to put in the same amount of working hours necessary to satisfy him. But in the current organization of society, yes, because the manufacturing process and commerce divided production conditions in such a way, that he who works is obligated to cultivate the frivolous arts with as much eagerness as the useful arts, to satisfy capricious requests as well as necessary requests; because it is always with his primal needs that he exposes himself, it is always hunger that he must fight, the first necessities of life which he must provide.

Whether it is to adorn the hem of a woman's dress, with lace finer to an imperceptible degree, or to add another insignia to a chauffeur's uniform, or to give furniture an extra finish that no one will notice the difference of, however languid a desire may be, it will always be for the worker a matter of life and death to be able to satisfy them. He has no choice but to satisfy the most frivolous whim of some great lady who is buying merchandise, a whim that she ignores herself until the moment when the object's presence awakens her desires, or else the worker ceases to eat. Hunger will have him making the same sacrifices as a plowman who must provide for the subsistence of all; he in fact makes even bigger ones. He will also work incessantly, as harshly; he will submit to a monotony of the most mind-numbing occupations, to more precarious condition as to rewards; he will live in a suffocating, mephytic, poisonous atmosphere, which will destroy his lungs; he will resign himself to be either standing, or lying, or sitting, for hours in an attitude which swell his bones and make him stunted; he will serve a machine whose blind and gigantic power will make him run the risk, at the slightest negligence, of being crushed between cogs. All this suffering, he won't just accept it

205

for himself, he will share them with his wife and children; at the same time exposing them to a still more dangerous morality contagion. He will degrade himself into stifling the feelings of nature, by selling the beings who are most dear to him into slavery, and of whom he ought to be their

sole protector. So the bread he buys he will pay at the price of his fatigue, his health, his intelligence, his affections and its morality. For the worker who provides the whims of luxury and fashion, this series of sacrifices is a necessity, it is the price for which he obtains the permission to live, it is the result of an inescapable system of constraint by which our society forces the laborer to satisfy frivolous desires and whims. But behind this system of constraint, it is necessary to examine the very will of society; it must be asked whether it really wants whatever it enforces. It is a question how much it wants to satisfy each of the most frivolous tastes of its elites, how much it wants to demand, on pain of death, that cotton thread acquire a degree of ever more finesse; when this means a death penalty, not only for the body, but for intelligence and for the soul. It is also a question of whether it is paying too much for the work it does, if it is knowingly and with reflection that it wants this improvement of the industry, wherein we are all represented, as the goal of all its efforts.

Society, after all, does not want anything like it; it has allowed a system of constraint based on universal competition to be organized within its midst, which stimulates the conception of industrialists, which pushes capitalists into advancing their capital, which determines the workers to offer their manual labor at discounts, and scientists to submit man to all the forces of nature, without ever realizing what it wants to accomplish by these gigantic efforts. Society has strongly and above all wanted the production of subsistence, but once that has been obtained its intent must change; it's no longer the consumers that it has to take care of, it is the producers now. It wants, or must want, that through work,

206

the worker finds his livelihood, but it does not want the worker to be, and born for a job that does not matter to him; it must want those whose job it is to fulfill the frivolous pleasures of the rich to participate in the common well-being, but it cares little for the acquisition of these pleasures and it would not want to provide them at the cost of physical suffering, the moral degradation of any of the members of the association.

Indeed, at the time of the introduction of a new manufacture in a region of the country, it is the producer who is being thought of, it is the benefit of offering work and bread to the poor workers, to a population without resources, that is the point of argument. The founder of the manufacture undoubtedly acts from the perspective of his own prospective profit, but he does not fail to make sure he is considered to be the benefactor of the country where he settles, for he comes, as he says, to distribute wages to the destitute who could not obtain any previously. There is indeed some contradiction between this claim to merit and the avowed aim of any new manufacture; which goal is to do the same quantity of work with fewer hands. But this contradiction is hardly noticed, while the fact that a new work location is requested, that new job opportunities are offered in places that were previously languid, strikes all eyes. Goods are to be produced soon, new prosperity is created, a new population is called into existence;

giving value to all the agricultural products in the neighborhood, and everyone is happy.

When the mechanism for spinning cotton (spinning frame) was perfected in 1769 by Arkwright, and that power extracted from a watercourse had made it capable of quickly performing one of the most delicate jobs done by human beings, great amounts of capital was immediately destined to found what in England are called factories; that is to say, factories on the largest scale, along rivers in Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, and Lancashire. This region was, in a way, the Switzerland of England, a country of mountains, rivers, and valleys;

207

still undeveloped, where agriculture was not profitable, the population small in number, but in which abundant waterfalls offered the mechanic a force from which Arkwright had taught to draw an immense profit, and which, already before him, had been started to be employed by industry. The factories called in workers from all parts of England; they offered them wages superior to those they obtained in other occupations; they contacted begging depots in London and other large cities, to deliver them the children who were housed there, run by public charity. These children were tied to teachers for seven years, by the clauses of the apprenticeship statute, which put apprentices under the orders of a master feeding them, and which authorized him to force them to work by corporal punishment, and without paying them wages. That was the start of a cruel system of oppression, which cost these workers, especially the children, abandoned, without protectors, far from the wishes of the public, under the orders of greedy masters, thousands and thousands of victims. This system was finally revealed to the English public by the first parliamentary surveys of 1796. However, the general appearance of districts where factories had been built was at first that of a high prosperity. The heads of all these new factories made considerable profits; the population grew with the most extraordinary rapidity, in spite of the contagious fevers with high mortality rates which were alarming to the region. The wages of the workers, even without being as high as first advertised, made them live in abundance, and agriculture thrived around the factories, because of the rich market that had been opened for them. (1)

But the prosperity of the new producer who gets richer must not close our eyes to the misery of the producer that competition has ruined. Before the establishment of the cotton factories, the manufacture of

(1) Edw. Baines, *History of the cotton manufacture*, ch. ix, p. 147.
– *Quarterly Review*, No XIV, p. 399.

208

cotton already existed in England. Arkwright's inventions, those of Lewis Paul, and of all those men with rare talents, who day in day out perfected the spinning and weaving mechanisms, and who each obtained a patent;

during fourteen years, of their discoveries, ruined their rivals through profit alone, because they put the innovators in a state to sell their products at a much lower price than the old establishments did. The historian of the cotton factories points out the efforts of these rivals to resist the calamity that had befallen them, and the trials in which the inventors were hired; but he stigmatizes them as effects of the base greed and jealousy of these formerly established manufacturers. It was for the innovators' existence however, that these were struggling. In addition, the manufacturers of cotton represented on the trial formed only a very small section of those whose industry had just been sacrificed; the overwhelming part of that body was scattered throughout households, they did not notice that they had a common interest. In England, before the immense progress in the manufacture of cotton, as today throughout the continent, every woman spun or knitted in her spare time; traces of this habit are still noticed in the English language, where all unmarried woman are designated by the name of spinster. All linens, all knitwear consumed in the kingdom, were then the product of a domestic industry.

This industry was probably doing this work, done today by machines, much more slowly; it was all annihilated too, because no spinner, no tritcher can compete with these perfected mechanisms. It cannot be said, however, that the nation itself has been a winner; it has become almost impossible now to find a profitable work that every woman can do at home. So there were more than a million who spun and knitted in their spare time; which today must mean that such time is being wasted. The incredible improvements undertaken by the English cotton industry, since that time until the present moment, the prodigious development that

was spurred on, must above all be explained in this way: it occupies the place of another industry which was then almost universal, it has ruined many more producers than it enriched: and it must be so, because each invention 'is a saving of labor, and an economy on the larger scale. We may want to believe that English consumers, tempted by their cheapness, use a little more white goods than they did sixty years ago, although the comparison of English customs with those of the continent suggest the opposite conclusion. But suppose that the consumption of each individual has doubled, and the population has also doubled since 1791, so that the English would consume four times more white goods than then. At that time, England imported from America: one hundred eighty-nine thousand, three hundred sixteen pounds of cotton, and in 1834 it took in: three hundred eighty-four million, seven hundred seventeen thousand, nine hundred seven pounds, or more than two thousand times more. Three-fifths of these cotton products are exported again, but two-fifths remain in England. How is it that, while the consumption of fabrics by the English increased only about four times, their consumption of cotton increased eight hundred times? This is because manufactured cotton has replaced all the white goods produced domestically, without counting a considerable quantity of all other fabrics like: flax, hemp and wool, which used to be

products of other English manufactures.

Thus, at the very time when the prosperity of manufacturing was real, striking everyone's attention, when the factory owners all made their fortune, when their workers were well paid, when the work never failed to materialize, and when the wealth seemed to circulate to districts other than where it had been established; it was not true that the actual producers, taken en masse, prospered with the manufacture. The labor saving had been having its natural and necessary effect, leaving a lot of unemployed labor; the rivers of Lancashire were performing a work which they had taken from

210

all the poor women of England. They did it well, and with economy, but all these poor women had lost an occupation which they have never been able to replace.

Cotton manufacturing took new developments in England when the invention of the steam engine made it possible to create a factory just about anywhere one wanted a power engine, previously only found in some valleys. New factories, even bigger than the previous generation, were built, either in large cities, or in the vicinity of coal mines, and inventions always new, always more admirable, have always been saving more work, previously done by humans. The exclusive use of each new invention has always been guaranteed to its inventor for fourteen years, by a patent, so that a monopoly is always insured for each new manufacturer to the detriment of the old.

From then on also the suffering of the producers manifested itself, not only in the isolated dwellings, in the embrace of households, that were losing one of their resources, but in large manufacturing establishments that could no longer compete with newcomers having innovated. It's in effect, a consequence of the encouragement given to inventors, that every really important discovery in mechanics, each of which produce a saving of work and considerable profit (1), immediately creates a new factory to exclusively draw the profits to. This factory is not intended to satisfy any new needs, but to undersell the old manufacturers. We must be allowed this English expression

(1) These inventions followed one another with inconceivable rapidity. After Arkwright, who introduced the 'spinning frame' and the 'drawing frame', and Lewis Paul, inventor of the carding machine, Hargreaves introduced the 'spinning jenny'; Crompton, 'the mule'; Cartwright, 'the power loom'; Johnson, 'the dressing machine'; Roberts, 'the self-acting mule'; Whitney, 'the saw gin', and each of these mechanisms, which perhaps do not yet have names in French, caused a revolution in manufacturing. (See Baines, History of the cotton manufacture.)

211

to represent an operation that is the basis of English commerce. The needs did not expand, the number of buyers did not increase; but, thanks to the new invention, those who exercise their monopoly can sell cheaper than

their predecessors, and consequently take over all their practices. To get the greatest possible returns from this discovery, it would be necessary that the new factory could supply the market on its own. It is far from reaching this goal no doubt, but thanks to the overabundance of capital, thanks to the eagerness of the banks to make advances in banknotes, millions of francs are soon collected for the new business, and millions of ells of cotton fabrics are suddenly thrown on a market that never asked for them. Domestic consumption is hardly susceptible to a further increase either; cotton fabrics have already taken the place of all the other fabrics for which it can be substituted; and while it is true that a few new jobs are emerging as well; as for instance cotton canvases are used today in bookbinding, these are replacing the calf or sheepskin leathers, to the detriment of the industry that produced them; but, in general, it is a foreign market that this supernumerary production must have as its destination. When the new factory began its gigantic operations, the older factory of which it endeavors to obtain its clientele has neither suspended nor slowed down its own, on the contrary, it is working with all its might to regain the possession of their market. It is its very existence that it defends, and it's a fight to the death. The owner is satisfied with a much smaller profit; often he even works at a loss, just to maintain his credit. He gives up everything, depreciation on his buildings and machinery; he compels his starving workers to settle for the most miserable wage, rather than to be fired and lose everything; after working during the day, they also work at night, and the quantity of products for sale exceeds the needs of consumption every day more and more. So the most appalling congestion is the usual state of affairs, the inevitable result this type of manufacture is the cause of which has encroached all

others; a manufacture so praised by England, so envied by other nations. It is no longer a mercantile interest, it's a national interest, it's a matter of life in England so that it can continue to keep its fifteen hundred thousand cotton workers employed. To this end, it is taking turns to focus its efforts on America which produces the cotton, and where it strives to obtain it always at a lower cost; towards manufacturing, where it strives to produce at a lower price; to foreign markets, throughout the entire world, where it strives to penetrate markets with its fabrics. But it never succeeds in any of these attempts, without producing a calamity. If it manages to buy cotton at a lower price, the American planter will lose part of his revenue, and the unfortunate negro slave will be more malnourished, and mistreated worse; if it succeeds in producing the fabric more cheaply, it will be by engaging capitalists to be content with less interest, manufacturers and merchants with less profit, and the unfortunate workers, whose existence is already hard enough, less pay; if it expands its market abroad, if it succeeds in its current efforts to penetrate the market for its cotton fabrics in Turkey, in Persia, in Africa, it will be to the detriment of a small number of factories, there; and this goes especially so for the domestic industry of the peoples who will go along with it, as this will force their wives to put down the

distaff as the English women have long been demanding. It is not the industry per se, there are not manufacturing inventions that directly cause all these calamities, it is the two operations which today characterize the whole mercantile spirit in England, and which have no other names than their English names: 'to overtrade' and 'to undersell' – overtrade means: pushing the trade to excess, it is producing or importing out of proportion to the needs of consumers so as to encumber the market; 'to undersell', it means to ascertain the flow of its goods, sell them at a lower price than any other producer can, thus ruining him by driving him out of a market, by simply working for less profit than he does, or even at a loss.

The cotton factory in England, however, is considered to be in a brilliant state of prosperity; its factories are palaces, its machines are finished with inimitable perfection, its workers are more numerous than those of any industry. and its exports are increasing every year in value. Prices, on the other hand, are falling and have continued to fall; they are so reduced that one feels a deep sense of pity in calculating how badly so much industry is rewarded: the capital which is employed there earns only minimal interest; the profits of the owners are reduced to almost nothing; while the older machines, even the entire factory, having been superseded by innovations lose all their value; the immense capital that had been invested in their construction is destroyed; and finally, the fate of its workers has become so deplorable, the privations to which they are subjected, the destruction of their health, the corruption of their morality, the daily sacrifice of their children, present such a compilation of suffering, that we are reluctant to paint a full picture of it here, especially since we would have to borrow it from parliamentary reports and inquiries, not our own observations (1).

(1) On the appalling fate of the workers in the cotton factories, one can consult:

1. 'Report from the committee on the bill to regulate the labor of children in the mills', folio, 1832.
2. 'Report of factory commissioners', fol., 1833, 1834.
3. 'Reports and evidence of the parliamentary committee on the factory question', fol., 1832.
4. 'The curse of the factory system, by John Fielden, M.P. and manu-bill', 1836.
5. 'Factory statistics, in a series of letters by the late M.T. Sadler, Esq.' 1834.
6. 'An inquiry into the state of the manufacturing population', 1831.
7. 'The moral and physical condition of the working classes employed in the cotton manufacture in Manchester, by James Philip. Kay, M.D.' 1832.
8. 'The evils of the factory system, by Charles Wing, member of the royal Society of surgeons, and one of the surgeons to the royal metropolitan hospital for children, London', 8°, 1836.

One would find in these works and reports sufficient extracts.

We will only point to a single circumstance that will explain this kind of fever that torments the factories, this rapid back and forth of exaggerated activity, and complete stagnation. With the immensity of the capital being employed in the factories, and the relatively tiny profits, the owners are well aware of being in the process of ruining themselves in the absence of running orders; But, on the other hand, they seek and solicit these orders

with extreme activity, and do not reject any of those that are offered to them; and often undertake works far beyond of what they can accomplish. Then not only do they hire new workers, but they run their factories night and day; among the manufacturers, some engage in 'long hours', and work up to twenty hours in a row; the others get up, and in the morning enter the still warm bed from which their colleagues just arose. It is a way of living that destroys their health; and this contagion spreads, so that the children develop rickets and become deformed for the rest of their lives. But this activity is only short lived; when the order is completed, all workers are dismissed until the owners can procure another one; and this populace, exhausted by the work just accomplished, is suddenly doomed, and, without being able to take precautions, finds itself in a still more desperate state of idleness, misery and famine.

No example is more striking than that of the English cotton factory, the most powerful, according to its admirers, the most flourishing in the world; and the one that most other nations nowadays are doing their best to take away from England, but their history too is roughly that of all the others. The establishment of a manufactory is almost always due to some industrial arts' application of some scientific process, which allows one to do with the forces of nature what was done before with the forces of man;

[(1a)] parliamentary reports are mentioned first, but which are difficult to obtain on the continent.

9. 'A voice from the factories', 8°, 1836.

These works are analyzed in volume LVII of the 'Quarterly Review', for December 1836.

almost always also, the manufacture produces a displacement of industry; this, at the origin of society, was established at the consumer's location. Scientific discoveries allowed these to be moved away, so as to transport the products from the places where one finds these to be exploited natural forces. Also, at the time of their establishment, in the district where they are located, they seem very beneficial; and although their purposes and benefits, which are claimed to save on human labor, on the contrary seem to distribute work and wages to fewer, creating idlers. A new invention, perhaps one imported from abroad, gives to the manufacturer the means of establishing a better market for his merchandise than those of his rivals, or competitors; and whilst this advantage lasts, the workers he employs are well paid and live in abundance. It will be then that those workers can get married, with rapidly growing families; it is also then that redundant pairs of hands of all the other trades arrive to seek jobs in the thriving factory; when all the younger people, having arrived at the stage in their lives when choosing a career presses, will embrace the one they see prosper. It is in the nature of the industrial arts however, that inventions follow one another, that a new discovery comes to take away the fruits of the previous one; and so the period of prosperity for any one manufacture is promptly followed by a period of distress. We just need to know that a particular factory is flourishing today, in order to predict, almost with certainty, that

in ten years, and often in far less time still, that in all probability, it will have had to succumb to their competition; because the more advances in science are made and the more gigantic its steps, the more discoveries will follow one another with an acceleration that doesn't leave the time even for recognizing the advancement.

By the application of some discovery in the arts or in the sciences, by the invention of some new process, the products of any manufacture who is flourishing today, will be replaced with others that will cost less; but these will require new machines and new men, or at least men who have done a new apprenticeship on them. Innovating owners, at the time of what at present are the old processes, cannot be resigned to sacrificing all the

216

value of their old machines, including the skills acquired to operate them. They will reduce their profits and wages; they will lower their prices, they will fight for their lives, but they will not be able to save any of it. This trance threatens everyone's operation in turn. The one established today like the one which has already had several years of existence. This fate is the inevitable future of any manufacturer, under the regime of universal competition. Wouldn't it have been better for England, would it not have been better for all the cotton manufacturers if they had never come into being? Would it not be better, for countries where today they are trying to create a rival factory, if we would not have created a population that is constantly exposed to deprivation, disease, immorality and famine, all those who wear cotton clothes after having done without them for all their lives; let alone having to pay a few cents more for them by buying them from foreigners?

The advantages and disadvantages of manufactures have thus been probed, in the two most important aspects of it: that of consumers, on their merit as usefully applied industrial arts, as well as satisfying the demand of the market, and that of the producers; or the ease which they spread among the owners and among the workers, and the stability they will provide on the condition of each other. But it is in another way, more often than not, that they are appreciated by the population in general. Among the peoples who so eagerly desire getting a job in the industry, it is not to buy their fabrics cheaper that the great mass of citizens rejoices to see a factory arise in its midst, it is for an abstract, general advantage, which in everyone's mind seems to mean the whole nation, and something that no one relates to themselves. It is, we are told, so that such industry no longer depends on outsiders; or, so that the mass of produced things to be exchanged is more considerable, exchanges follow up on one another quicker, and with more goods being produced, more needs become satisfied; or finally, it is so that the balance of trade is

217

ceaselessly sold to us in money, and that the mass of specie thus increases in our favor.

It is true that these general reasons are not those which invoke the heads of factories to initiate works. Their reasonings are animated and must come from very personal interests; seeking their own advantage, that their aim is determined. They perceive very well how they will find it in competition, which they will engage in with those who rose before them; that is to say, either abroad or in their own country. They count on earning a certain amount by applying scientific discoveries to their industry, of course they are far from figuring that a later discovery is bound to catch up with theirs and take away their market in turn. They win, at least initially by their fight against workers, keeping wages low; they win by the constraint they exert on them, and which reduces a part of the nation to labor for the most frivolous luxury production for their owners, with the same energy as if it were for the subsistence of all. All industrial entrepreneurs are hellbent on achieving their goal, without the slightest consideration as to whether this is right or wrong to society as a whole. Yet there is some satisfaction in seeing that the bulk of the people are looking at these questions of political economy more selflessly, even though these may yet be in error insofar the abstract system being embraced; it's nevertheless honorable for the human species, that the suffering resulting from a disappointing pursuit is not due to greed alone.

This public prosperity however, tied to the extension of the manufacturing industry, when it does not with it convey a greater ease for manufacturers, is nothing but a great illusion. What does the fear of making our industry dependent on foreigners, mean? One doesn't pay a price when one enters into an exchange on equal terms. It doesn't matter to the person who buys the items needed, whether these are foreign or domestically made; his only concern is that the price is right and the quality is there; no other worries enter his mind. It is true enough however, that for society the question is a little more complicated.

218

It suits each nation that all the items which have been produced on its territory find a buyer, because there is no doubt that all internal work should be rewarded, that everyone finds a way to live when one strives in good faith to contribute to the common good; but that this interest of society must impress on anyone to ensure that it does not result in useless or unprofitable work, and not to embark on just any industrial path. The consumer is reimbursing all advances made to produce any commodity; and if the producer does not find a consumer, the nation will be obliged to come to his aid, because its first law must be not to let any of its members perish of hunger.

But if the items the buyer needs are not made in the country, that country can only find it beneficial to train workers to produce them in the future; which would be to the advantage of these workers themselves.

It is true that there may be motives of a different nature, motives foreign to chrematistics, to encourage industries which produce the objects necessary for subsistence production, or national defense. Existence and safety must come before wealth, and a people must not regret the need for sacrifices to

be made, so as to during a war deprive foreigners of the means to dictate the law to them. But as for all the objects that can be done without, as for all those things which are only enjoyments, there is neither a dependence nor humiliation in receiving them from strangers; and one must think of producing them domestically only under the double condition of making the class of industrialists that will be doing the production for this purpose, a reward which is sufficient to maintain a happy and honorable existence for them, and to render such an advantage not temporary but durable, as the condition of the men he owes a sustenance depends on it. A nation must measure its interest in the new industry, only on the happiness it can permanently guarantee to all those involved in its existence. If, on the contrary, it promises them nothing but dependence and misery, if it condemns them to live day by day, to feel constantly exposed to their livelihood

219

being taken away from them through no fault of their own, without any cautionary activity open to them that could be saving them and their families from the most frightful distress, it is doubtlessly better for society to be served by strangers. It is better to pay foreigners to take on such deplorable functions; as these are not tributes, but pledges. In Paris it is the Auvergnats, who perform the most disgusting work required for keeping all large cities clean; will it therefore be concluded that the necessary capital for this industry, is dependent on the mountains of the Auvergne, where these people originate? There is a village in Switzerland which, for centuries, has been having the right of providing executioners to all the cantons; are we to conclude that Switzerland is dependent on this village for the scaffolding industry?

The second motive that we are given as an argument to favor industry, so as to accelerate all kinds of production, is with then the mass of things to be exchanged then being greater, the movement of trade will be faster; and the more commodities, we are told, being produced, the more needs will be satisfied, and there will be more pleasures to be enjoyed for everyone. We believe that those who reason in such manner, get lost in the pursuit of abstractions; that they show us that more pleasures exist in the first place, and then we will recognize that more wealth is created. We know that, in many different ways, goods can cease to be riches or to give pleasures, either because they do not conform to the needs and tastes of consumers, or these do not have the means to buy them, or pay for them what they are worth. We have seen that the very goods whose production matters the least to society, usually become produced only because those who work at them have no other way to obtain the necessities of life. But if workers are to be cajoled into a need to prepare for others all their pleasures of luxury, it is making a mockery of talking about his own pleasures, since, on the contrary, it is only to the extent that he is deprived of pleasures himself that those luxury items can be at all produced by him.

This philosophical error, which confuses the increase in

productions with that of wealth, this error on which the whole system of modern chrematistics rests, finds its origin in the vagueness attached to the notion of the extent of a market, and in the confusion between the earlier exchanges of commercial goods and the final exchange of consumption goods. Economists designate by the words, “extent of the market”, not only the distance to which a producer can export his products with the hope of selling them, but the power and the will to buy of all those who are included in this radius. If, in order to encourage the founding of a new manufacture, the promoters of that industry had said to the inventor: look for some new application of the mechanical arts which can spare the labor of man to us; to the capitalist: advance us new funds; and to industrial workers: give up your present job to embrace the one that we teach to you, and by our combined efforts we will be able to ruin all the competition, putting them in no condition to sell a portion of their products; they will fail, they will starve, and we will swim in abundance; everyone would have shrunk away from this proposal. Each would have answered that he was not so deaf to humanity’s call, so as to found his own fortune on the destruction of his fellow human beings. But the promoters of industrialism have themselves lost sight of this reality, or caused others to lose sight of it, by directing all their attention to abstract reasoning. The scope of any market, they told them, is unlimited; lower your prices, and your goods can reach to the ends of the known world; lower your prices, and, in your own country, the lower and ever-increasing classes will be able to buy your goods; lower your prices and produce boldly, as excesses of this kind are impossible, the activity of commerce cannot be exaggerated. What the English have called ‘over-trading’ has no reality, because the more wealth will be produced, and the more the people will enjoy and consume (1).

(1) See, in this very session (1837), a speech by Mr. Atwood, in which he denies the possibility of ‘over-trading’ at the same time when all others were forced to recognize its disastrous effects.

A Scottish economist, who likes to conduct his reasoning in abstract and stark forms, said: commerce will necessarily increase with the increase in wealth; thus field A, the first year, produced one hundred sacks of wheat, and workshop B, the same year, produced a hundred yards of cloth; after which the bags are exchanged at par against the yards. The following year, the same field produced a thousand sacks of wheat, the same workshop a thousand yards of cloth; why shouldn't they also trade at par? Why should the exchange not also take place if it was about ten thousand or, for that matter, one hundred thousand? According to his usage of proposition, the Scottish philosopher has forgotten to put man in his reasoning. If he had remembered that the realistic criterion was not a field and a workshop, but two men, one of whom was a farmer, the other a craftsman, who had to

exchange the surplus of their products, for which they did not have any use themselves, he would have noticed that he was expressing himself in an absurdity. One of the two men, after buying the wheat which he needs for food, is no longer hungry, and does not want more, regardless of the amount produced by his neighbor's field; the other, after buying fabrics with which to dress, is no longer cold, and does not want more of them, whatever the activity of the manufacture.

The scope of the market is therefore always limited by two very sovereign circumstances, the need or the convenience of buyers, and their means of paying. It's not enough to be hungry to buy wheat, you still need to have the means of paying for it; also the population may well increase, but if its revenue does not increase, its consumption won't increase either. On the other hand it is not enough to have a revenue to buy wheat, you have to be able to eat it too. Now, not only the amount of wheat that can be eaten by any given population is limited, the amount of manufacturing products it has a use for is also limited. And while it may well be true that the rich may not put any other limits to their enjoyments than their wealth itself; the quantity of manufacturing products that the rich consume is singularly small: the purpose of manufacturing

222

is to produce cheaply, the aim of the rich is to consume expensive things, rare things, that set them out from the crowd. As soon as a product, such as lace, begins to be multiplied in abundance by some factory, and it becomes to be within reach of the common man, they consider it no longer worth buying. Therefore they are preferentially attracted to the artistic rather than the mass producer; to the embroiderer and the sculptor, rather than to the merchant of painted fabrics. The poor, the man who needs to work for a living, necessarily forms by far the greatest part of manufactured-product consumption. But in order for him to be able to buy them, as their quantity increases, his wage must be increased; because wages form just about the entire revenue of the working man. Thus the low price of labor, far from being, as has been claimed, a cause of prosperity for the factories, is for them a sure cause of ruin; a cause which keeps the great mass of buyers away from them. The high price of labor, on the contrary, will enable the day laborer to buy as much of their goods from the factories as he can consume without ceasing to be poor, without ceasing to be a day laborer; but this quantity is singularly limited. When day laborers have doubled, when they have quadrupled, if you will, it is impossible for them to go beyond their funds for food and clothing. Thus the limit of the internal market is very quickly reached.

The manufacturer very quickly produced the quantity of goods which the poor can buy with their revenue, which the poor can make use of, given their habits. When domestic manufacturing continues to increase rapidly, it is seldom because the revenue of the people has increased or because its consumption increased. It is rather because people preferred the new merchandise over what it used to buy. There is thus a suffering industry right alongside a prosperous industry, and the damage of one is equal to

the profit of the other. When ailing industry was already established as a factory, one sees its decadence, and one hears the cries of distress of its workers; but if it were carried out by trades scattered throughout the extent of the territory, or better yet, if it were carried out

223

by women within the embrace of all families, a succumbing happens in the shadows, and yet a resulting distress is not any less real.

But the limit of the external market, we will be told, is none other than that of the known world, why would a nation not seek to infiltrate its goods as far as its means of trade can reach?

Why wouldn't it benefit from the progress it has made in the applied arts and sciences, to give foreigners a ruinous battle in their own markets, to under-sell their manufacturers, their artisans, their wives, to force them to close their workshops and be content with what it offers them? Why? Because our duties towards human society as a whole are analogous to our duties towards our compatriots; because we must no longer speculate any different on the ruin of the Turkish or Indian than that of the French and English; and finally, because what is unjust can never fundamentally be profitable, and if we ruin the industry and the artisans of others peoples, we will ruin our own consumers at home.

This same increasing flow of manufactures from abroad is presented to us in yet another form and as a third abstract advantage of the progress of industrialism.

Manufactures, we are told, provide the nation with an export trade, which calls for no return, and must be paid in precious-metal backed currency. This cash merges with wealth in the imagination of the vulgar, and one cannot even begin to guess how many people are dazzled by this annual cash import, that they have pinned their hopes on. However, for fifty years, this concept of enriching a nation by a balance paid with precious metals, or because a balance of trade has been identified, has been disputed by all the best economists, and its utter falsehood has been demonstrated. It has been a long time since we stopped responding to their arguments. Adam Smith's doctrine on money appears today the only one that we dare teaching, and yet the confusion between cash and wealth, between cash and capital, already battled by him, still lasts;

224

recently it was repeated again in all these discussions about banks; but we don't know how to fight it, because we don't know where to reach it; it is not a workable system, it presents only an image of chaos.

In a further Essay on the numeraire, we will endeavor to better clarify these ideas; here we will stick to only one short exposition of the illusions to which the export trade gives rise.

As the goal of any merchant is to sell, as he gets richer whenever he finds an advantageous flow of his merchandise, the inventors of the mercantile system and of the balance of trade concluded that a nation was in the same

position as a merchant, and that the more it sold, the more it prospered. But, although universal competition and the usual market congestion have made the operation of selling more difficult than that of buying; although at the same time being the most important, because of completing the transaction initiated by the purchase, thereby realizing either a profit or a loss; in fact the trade consists of the two operations combined, to buy to sell, and to redeem again. Also there is no merchant who, in the end, does not buy as much as he sells, and won't dispose of his cash almost as soon as he has received it. Neither does the manufacturing industry think of accumulating cash; it sells, but to buy raw materials and advance wages; it pays as much as it has received. To accumulate cash would be the same thing for them as to suspend industry, even to stop working altogether whereby providing working opportunities. If their returns are greater than originally disbursed from the manufacturing process, the difference forming their profits, it will be spend on maintenance, or on pleasures instead. Money is of value to them only as long as there is a way of getting rid of it. If it is buried, stones in its place would be equally valuable. It has been a very long time since La Fontaine told us exactly that. If a particular manufacturer only slows down the circulation, if he does with a lot of money what he could have done with just a little, by say a better combination of his payments and receipts, he will lose interest

225

on all the money he had been using too much; he gets poorer from all the cash that he lets stay in his wallet for too long. It is the same with a nation; it does not collect cash either, and far from getting richer, it would get poorer if it would be amassed. It is appropriate for any one nation to make its expenditures in the form of precious metals, which its cash needs to underly, in order to be able to carry out more promptly and more surely its purchases and sales. It is a value that it sacrifices to secure the stability of it commerce; but all parts of this expense, means a necessary loss for the nation. In general, it buys as much as it sells; it is not the latter operation which sets a national profit, it is the comparison between the two having occurred operations which establishes a difference, in either a profit or a loss.

But the philosophical economists who vanquished the mercantile system, have further argued that the quantity of national purchases always had to balance exactly the quantity of its sales. They maintained that no balance can for a longtime be sustained without being cleared through receiving or paying money; no more so by a nation than by an individual, because in the first case money would decrease in value, and in the second it would disappear. And as, however, a nation sends nothing for nothing to any of its neighbors, as a difference in cash is immediately followed by the purchase made with the same money of a new quantity of goods; it is certain, they add, that if we kept a regular account of imports and exports, including smuggling, we would find their perfectly equal value.

We agree with them that if a nation received more in the way of cash than it needs to use for its circulation, or that it does not care to melt down for

servicing its arts, it would re-export it, each wanting to avoid the loss that would cause dormant capital not returning any interest; that if, on the other hand, it happened to not have enough for its daily domestic transactions, it would buy some back with its goods, or it would make some cash come back on its credit; but in no way could we infer from that an existing

226

parity of national purchases with sales. In their calculation, economists neither took into account that a nation could owe, nor what it could lend to one another. In fact, most governments continue to behave according to the mercantile system, as if no reasoning had yet begun to shake it. There are, on closer inspection, a lot of cases in which we must recognize that domestic imports are by no means equal to its exports; and these cases, officially demonstrated, made much more of an impression than the old theories opposed to them.

If, for example, landowners are absent from their country, this country is burdened with a debt equal to that returned to the country where they have settled in; without having received back, any equivalent of this debt, and regardless there having been no displacement of wealth or capital, but only a displacement of people. This debt is discharged every year, not in cash, but by exporting foodstuffs or merchandise, which are sold to foreigners, without getting any return. This is how the soil of Ireland pays the Irish 'absentees owners' their pensions; it's also this cause however, that their absence always impoverishes their country more. If a government sees fit to pay a subsidy to a foreign government, this transaction between the two treasures takes place in cash, however this is not usually money that is sent from a country in the other, because most often there would be losses for both. disturbing the equilibrium; that is to say a loss for the country which would divest itself of its own numeraire, and also a loss for the one whose own circulation does not require it. Thus, for the most part, the country that pays a subsidy sends out goods for which it asks for no other return than bills of exchange in favor of the government to which the subsidy is paid. If a loan is taken out in favor of a foreign country, payment is made in the same way, not in cash, but in commodities, which obtain no other return than bills of exchange. These bills of exchange are

227

selling at a lower price when, at same time, there are many available; it is as if the commodities they are used to buy are falling in price. So there are profits to be made from these goods, but these profits are countered with the losses of those who draw up bills of exchange. These two operations, subsidies during the war, loans during peaceful times, have caused an artificial prosperity for English manufactures. They required an export of goods commensurate with the immense capital that the nation paid to foreigners; they therefore encouraged all types of manufacturing, and simultaneously raise the wages and profits from commerce. But, after the subsidies, the nation found itself burdened with a huge amount of debt for

all the goods exported during the war, with no hope of return. After having made the loans, the nation found itself in the possession of only claims on States, which refused to pay their debts, for the value of the exports made; the same goes for borrowers, with no hope of return.

Thus the English merchants had indeed become richer, but it was on the destruction of English capital that all their profits had been taken.

Today the American trade crisis highlights the importance of the capital that, in the course of commerce, one nation lends to another nation. Either American merchants would buy English futures, or they would profit from the credit offered to them by English bankers, who accepted their bills of exchange. It actually happened that a much of the American trade was carried out on English capital. Each year the Americans paid well for what they owed by a consignments of goods, and in particular of cotton, but at the same time that they erased an old debt, they contracted a new one; the claim from English trade to American trade, far from being extinguished by these partial payments, was growing year by year every year. When the crisis arrived, when the merchants could no longer succeed in selling the exorbitant quantity of goods which they had taken upon themselves; when the bottom fell out of the cotton

228

market, and the producers could not get rid of it at any price; when the bankers finally refused their credit, the moment of paying this commercial debt, which was constantly increasing, had finally arrived. Paying without contracting a new one, paying without transfers, paying either in cash, or in goods, without getting any return, however, was an extremity for which the debtor was by no means prepared. Already it is being made impossible to pay in cash by the suspension of the banks; if the English will no longer advance funds, some merchants undoubtedly will find it expedient not to pay in goods any more. Of all the solutions, the most improbable one is the English definitively withdrawing all the capital that they had advanced to America.

We could add to all these various causes of inequality between imports and exports, the considerable number of emigrants who each year leave rich, civilized countries and industrialists, to settle in poorer countries and more backward. Although each of them leaves his country with the intention to make a fortune, it is however from this country that he borrows his first advances. He takes with him a small capital, sometimes it's even considerable in size; he embarks with this cash, which passes from one country to another, without hope of return, in turn upsets the balance that economists are claiming to be so accurate.

It has been observed by this very enumeration, that any country exporting more than it imports, that any country not receiving in goods a value equal to that which it sends abroad, becomes impoverished. This is probably not some great discovery; because it would be difficult to understand how it could be otherwise. But this ever consistent result makes it all the more

strange, the favor than all governments accord to the export trade. Since any export either is an expense, or is an exchange, any export, that isn't offset by an equal import, is a loss. Under either assumption, there is no reason to give it preference over imports.

Should we conclude therefore, that the export trade is without

229

utility? No doubt, like any other business, it is based on a supposedly equal exchange; and in an equal exchange, both parties find an equal advantage, that of satisfying their own convenience. Every country, every region has its own riches; it has more than its inhabitants can consume, it values and desires that of other places; and the exchange satisfies them both. The true benefit of this exchange is the enjoyment of the consumer in both countries. Of secondary importance is the profit that this same consumer allocates to the shopkeeper for his trouble. But wanting to give oneself an export trade, less for the benefit of the consumer than for that of the trader himself; wanting to create factories to develop an export trade is to forget the end for the means, it is to forget man to see only things, and again to entirely misjudge the situation.

But when a manufactory does exist, and when it's already disproportionate to a country's needs; when it produces far more in the way of goods than its inhabitants can consume; when offers those to them cheaper every day, and therefore always reduces not only the wages of those it employs but its own profits as well; when, with the help of ever new discoveries, its activities and its means of production increase with the most frightening acceleration, while at the same time dismissals and the misery of its workers are growingly distressing; this factory needs export trade to have any chance of surviving at all. It needs to seek buyers to the ends of the earth; that will relieve it of the clutter under which it is nearly suffocating. But then, what is a relief for it is an evil for others; it wants to unload on other countries the burden which is overwhelming it; it wants, so that its own manufacturers do not perish, to take the livelihood for manufacturers and artisans in all other countries away, who are preparing goods similar to its own; it wants to destroy the small workshop industry, that of the independent trades,

230

and that of families, there. So we should not be surprised if a national feeling, that is universal and stronger than self-interest and the quest for cheapness, stronger than systematic reasoning, has awakened, in countries flooded with products that are manufactured to repel their own well being. Freedom of trade was a good thing when trade was based on mutual needs, for mutual benefits; when the nations, keeping onto a natural proportion of classes in each society, mainly thought a meeting of their own needs first, and only then looked at foreign markets as no more than an accessory. But a frightening disproportion between the classes in one country is now threatening all the others. To the class that has unduly grown, a frightening

competition makes its effects felt every day; in a most threatening tone, that it is too much, that it must cease to exist. That wind, water, and steam, are sufficient to do its work, and unless it succeeds in bringing down this sentence of proscription on the class which has been replaced by these and will in other countries; then it is no longer about the benefits of cheapness in the markets, nor about consumer or merchant benefits; considerations of a completely different order must occupy the statesman: he must stop a social disturbance which has already caused far too much suffering; he must save his constituents, the peoples whose guardianship is entrusted to him, from misery and death. Indeed, while economic theorists sovereignly decided that the most unlimited freedom of commerce should, in any case, be the practice of all nations, and in having displayed a deep contempt for those who oppose them, and who thus show themselves, as they say, are incapable of understanding them, the interest of all those who see their national industry faltering, struggling with such a formidable rivalry, has everywhere been warning them against their theory; and this interest has shown itself to be so obstinate in its resistance, that statesmen have given in to it everywhere, and that even those who, before coming to power, had acquired a reputation for their progress in chrematistic science, have never dared to carry out what they had long meditated on, the removal of all obstacles in nation-to-nation trade.

231

One cannot without astonishment notice how much, as soon as vested interests get involved, reasoning bends and accommodates to passions, how much different the theories that we take for ourselves are from those we want to give to others. The principle of the indefinite freedom of all commerce; the abolition of all obstacles to trade, is now professed by all English economists, by journal editors, in particular of a quarterly revue, especially talented, entitled 'the British and Foreign Review'. Therein they sought to arouse the sympathy of the English for the Turks, who are wise enough to buy everything they need from them; to arouse their animosity against the Russians, who are trying to prevent them from trading with us. But if there is so much wisdom in buying what foreigners produce better, rather than persisting in producing goods domestically, where then is the advantage of this exuberant production which they boast so much about, of this activity of industry which enables the English producers to undersell all foreigners in their own markets? How can the two systems, the Turkish one of renouncing its own to rely on manufactures from abroad, and the English contrariwise, of establishing new ones daily to provide consumer goods for the foreign markets – be advantageous at the same time?

We ask the reader to please keep in mind our observations on the various causes that can give a deceptive activity to the factories; an activity that, in the final analysis, is all paid for by the sacrifices of the very same nation in which the manufacture seems to prosper.

No doubt, heed will need to be taken when we spoke about the distress of factories, of the relentless work of its workers, the miserable food they are

forced to be satisfied with. And then, with the recurrent sudden suspension of their work, famine and disease which decimates them; then, it could be said we have only fixed our consideration on times of crisis and calamity. If however, we had watched six months or a year previously, we would have seen the same factories rewarding, liberally, or at least sufficiently, the work of all. Perhaps we could answer, with more

232

reason, that in the last thirty years, this prosperity has almost always been spurious. First it is well established, as customs records leave no doubt, that the importation of cottons, that the exportation of the fabrics which were made from them, have been increasing year by year, or even that a constant redoubling of manufacturing activity has been taking place; but activity is not all that manufactures need, they still need profits too; and from these same statements customs officials announced that each year prices have fallen, and that the most recent sales were made on more disadvantageous conditions. However, unless the contrary is also proved by these figures, we must conclude that despite this ever growing activity, cotton manufacturing always enriched the nation less; that such sales at lower prices left each producer: less depreciation allowances on buildings and fixed capital, less profit on circulating capital, and less wages for the workers. Then, when we compare, during these thirty years, the periods of high industrial prosperity with political events, we will find more often than not that it was the English who, with their own capital, bought their own goods to present to foreigners, and that as soon as this extraordinary demand for essentially free goods ceased, industrial activity also slowed down.

This is how the English government bought, until 1815, all the goods with which, in the final analysis, subsidies were paid to Austria, Prussia, Russia to wage war on France; that from then on it were English capitalists who bought the goods, with which loans from France itself, from Holland, from Austria, Naples, Greece, various governments from Spain and Portugal, and from all the governments of America, were paid off. This is again how the English capitalists made the funds of all the mining enterprises of Peru and Mexico valuable; and this is how the English bankers are still creating the funds for this 'overseas trade' that is flooding the United States with English goods. At these various times there was no doubt, on the part of the English,

233

any intention to present their goods essentially free to foreigners; judging by the returns, however, they did little anything else, and if we remove these reckless times of liberality from the number of years in which the English manufacturers did indeed prosper, there won't be many others to count.

As a result, although we are not saying that a factory is necessarily evil, its rapid development is always a danger. That is if along with it, it creates a

destitute population of its future, worried about its existence, unhappy about the current order, if finally it creates proletarians; what we, on the contrary are saying, is that such prosperity is a national calamity. Before the establishment of manufacturing, and of the class that is making it work, the State, as a whole, was more wealthy, more satisfied with its lot in life, more assured in the established order. Its population, it is true, was smaller, the gross product of its labor was less considerable, but the share of each in this product, the aliquot part which could be consumed, was greater, and the proportion between population and wealth, as a result, provided all with more than just material pleasures; while a population consuming a miserable wage, and possessing hardly anything beyond that, is for a nation an element neither of strength, happiness, nor of stability.

234

FIFTEENTH ESSAY

The Protection Once Given to the Useful Arts and What can be Done for them Today.

We have tried to make it clear in the previous Essay, that the development of modern nations, in pursuing industrialism, is dangerous; we looked at the very purpose of universal competition; we have seen them striving to produce more and more, without consulting the needs of consumption; to spare human labor for all its productions, without at all worrying about finding employment for laid-off workers; and finally to under-sell each other, without calculating this effect on the decrease in profits and wages that is causing the suffering of all, and we found this purpose itself to be detrimental to humanity as a whole. Every newspaper, every bit of correspondence that is coming out of the regions where manufacturing has now been established, reveals new hardships, new sufferings, greater uncertainty in the resources and the existence of a population always getting to be more numerous. Twenty-one years of peace, of moderation from governments, in their universally directed attention towards the public good, of progress in all the industrial arts, evermore following the studies of political economy; twenty-one years finally, which at first glance at least form an epoch of rare prosperity for Europe, have only ceaselessly worsened the position of the poor classes, brought on the crises in

235

manufacturing and commerce; and finally, disturbing everywhere at once the security in which the lucky authorities of the century were happily falling asleep holding the controls. Our reasoning is therefore powerfully supported by events; and we know that those who have long rejected our warnings, getting worried by a universal discomfort, are beginning to say

to themselves that there is undoubtedly something wrong with the social order, even though they do not want to admit that there is some truth to the principles from which we reason.

We are not surprised at the recurring difficulty we encounter in making ourselves heard; we have to fight notions which, at first glance, seem the most natural, notions which have been arranged by men of great talent in the form of a most specious system. We have to fight, and perhaps this is the biggest obstacle, this laziness of the human mind, which, having more or less intellectually closed the analysis of a science, refuses to go back to its first principles, to shake the axioms on which it rests, and to sort of go back to school and start studying all over again. We have to fight the interest and self-esteem of all those at the forefront of industry, who oversee and run their large companies, and who are still accustomed to singing each other's praise as good citizens because they are getting richer still; we have to combat the aversion of all men to turn their eyes to suffering and discouragement, and this aversion weakens us too, for we did not want to put before the eyes of readers the heartbreaking details of the fate of hapless workers and their children, who have filled our hearts with a bitterness to ourselves. With yet so many obstacles to overcome, we have made but little progress in public opinion; we would have achieved absolutely none, if ever more serious, ever more alarming events had not forced the public to submit themselves to a new examination, one after the other, of the questions that were thought to have already been decided a long time ago.

We feel however, that the circumstance most opposed to the dissemination of what we believe to be the true principles

of political economy, is the impossibility in which we are to present effective remedies for such great evils. It is the belief in a sort of fatality that drives us, and the willingness to turn a blind eye to the precipice towards which we all are running, as soon as one believes that it's all unavoidable in any case. We agree to such extreme evils, we cannot in fact offer more than palliatives which must appear disproportionate. We never spoke of prohibiting either inventions or new machinery; while seeing with pain the pushing back of human labor on all fronts, we have never invoked laws that would be hampering industry. We have mostly confined ourselves to advising neither to push, nor to accelerate a movement that is already too fast; and when we invoke legislation, the action we ask of it is so slow that it would not be able to satisfy those who would like to bring immediate relief to the evils of society.

We do believe however, it being necessary reminding our readers that the kind of suffering to which society is exposed to today is quite new; it is the consequence of the rapid progress which has been made over these last fifty years or so in the industrial arts; a progress which, at least during the first half of this period, seemed constantly advantageous, and which had not started to experience either congestion or discomfort, for twenty to twenty-five years or so. This suffering was revealed in England, the low

Countries, Switzerland, all countries of highly advanced manufacturers; long before these could be felt in France, where, after the exhaustion of the war, industry had much catching up to do before being able to fully satisfy the demands of the country. Other countries are still further from experiencing this congestion, which, under false abundance, also lets the producer languish in misery. The governments of Russia and Poland, with their energetic will, are pressing the rapid advancement of manufactures too; their progress in the last few years have been stupendous, and no one yet foresees in these countries that their deceptive prosperity at present is the forerunner of absolute destitution. Today however, any industry works

237

for the commerce of the world. The peoples themselves, who, by the most severe prohibitive laws they propose to burden these foreigners with, are delaying the introduction of foreign goods, non of which they are at all interested to receive.

It is therefore the world market that we must make our criterion; and this market, which, missing the complicating factors of imports and exports, is much easier to comprehend. So, if the commerce of the world proposes to produce as much as possible and to consume little; at least for this trade there can be no doubt that all its efforts tend to congestion.

The newer the current system and the apparent evils it causes, the more advisable it is to look for solutions in what was being done in the olden days. No science more than political economy has a need for being guided by practical experience. No theory has as much potential for deception, because in no one is it so difficult to take into account all the apparently independent circumstances which react to one another, and anticipate the repercussions of the changes that we have striven to produce herewith.

There is undoubtedly today a great suffering for the workers who, in a large part of Europe, are devoting themselves to the useful arts; but we do not see anything similarly happening in other parts of Europe. And while, true enough, the latter in no way pass for progressive ones; nothing at all similar occurred in countries outside of Europe either, except for perhaps in China and India, where our system has been wearing itself out before its results reached us; and to which we are experiencing the backlash of our excessive activities at this very moment. Finally, before manufacturing took a hold, there was no suffering, but, on the contrary, many guarantees existed that resulted in happiness for workers. In the old order of things, so much for their benefit had been calculated in; as it was workers who gave cities their regulations and order, that we may have been in too much of a hurry to abolish.

All those who once practiced the useful arts, all those who were to live on the industry practiced in the cities, before the French Revolution were distributed between guild corporations who each exercised some political power. Society had allowed those who cultivated the same industry to join forces to prescribe laws, to protect themselves against other members of the state, to protect themselves even within their corporations, against

unfair competition they could inflict upon one another. Today, all links have been broken between those who exercise the same profession; they are rivals, natural enemies of each other: their ancient association had made them brothers; it had them direct their efforts toward consumers, or, if you will, toward the rest of society. The whole organization of guild corporations tended to restrict the number of those who exercised the useful arts, to repel people from the countryside who wanted to enter the trades of the cities, to limit competition, to prevent congestion, to share also among all masters the benefits of the trade, insofar that one could not get rich at the expense of the other; finally, to give a guarantee to the small manufacturer, so that once having entered his profession, and provided he behaved well, he could count on rising in his field of expertise with slow but certain steps, and he was in no danger of seeing the bulk of his built-up fortune amassed in his younger years overturned in old age.

At the time of the guild trades, none of the industrial occupations could be exercised until after a long and expensive apprenticeship, which did not begin until after childhood.

This apprenticing limited competition to those who could make an initial sacrifice, both of time and money, and this effectively repelled most of the peasants who would have wanted to give up work in the fields for the city.

At the same time it also limited the number of those that the city itself could intend to any particular industrial trade. It deprived tradespeople of the dangerous bait offered today by manufacturers, the encouragement to procreate offspring, to misuse them from the age of six or eight to start earning a living for their parents, to the detriment of their health and moral development.

The masters refused to take on apprentices when the profession did not at all prosper, 'was not going strong' in their locality; and this was an even more effective obstacle brought on

against a reckless competition, to the creation of products that would not be requested. The apprentice entered the family of his master according to a contract which most often tied him down for several years. If sometimes he had to suffer from a rudeness and lack of education of his master, on the other hand he felt the advantage of forming an intimate acquaintance with him in a close family bond, and of gaining a certain affection there which is maintained by the equality of state between the master and apprentice.

In the early days of Rome slavery itself was tolerable, because the slave ate his master at the plowman's table. In the 'latifundia', on the contrary, the slave was no longer a human being associated with his master, as a boarder, but a thing. Even there, however, he was more or less known to his master; while a worker entering a factory nowadays is lost in a crowd of a thousand, whose face is not even noticed, whose fate is never known to the master millionaire who pays him. In the olden days, when a single

apprentice was introduced into the family of his master, where he ate at his table, he was not subject to more than moderate work, with hours and days of peace and relaxation, almost always with time allocated for his moral instruction.

Once the apprenticeship was completed, the young craftsman was taken on as a companion to a master; he began to make a living from his work, to gain experience, but was in no way already established. The regulations of the trades, which ensured above all that no appropriation of profits by a single master, at the expense of his colleagues in the profession, could come about, also allowed him to take on one or at most two companions. Some advantage, some credit was assured to a young craftsman who had displayed a superior skill, but it was by this skill, not by a superior capital, that the best pupil outweighed the others; all found work however, all were sure of making a living. Goods were never offered at a discount, no clutter ever wiped out the value of the shopkeeper having filled his store, or the the very wealth of society as a whole. During companionship, a workman

240

would travel from town to town, which thus formed his mind; he got used to independence, he learned the proportion between the population and the demand for his type of work; until discovering the place where he would be assured of sufficient work, and where he could establish himself with prospects to advance.

This establishment and the acquisition of mastery could only be obtained with the approval of the governing body where he wished to enter. It was then also that he made his 'masterpiece', and that, rising above all daily routine, he cultivated, at least once in his life, his art for the sake of art itself. Also, he thus used the little capital he had accumulated to buy tools, to set up his workshop, to assemble the goods for his household and to get married, for his life was now assured, he had entered home port. If he would have had the imprudence to look for a woman earlier, he probably would not have found her, because he had nothing of his own to offer. But from then on his career, the entry of which no doubt would have been difficult, he became independent and happy; every step had brought him closer to a better state, and now vice alone could ruin it. Even some illness would not by itself take away his status in life; as his companion and his apprentice would be working to fill his account. His wife however, would be remaining in charge of the care of his household, of the cleanliness of its interior, and of the education of his children.

We can no doubt ask whether this organization of the useful arts would never have allowed them to take advantage, as they have done today, from our progress in science; we may ask if consumers were served as well, if they got plenty and cheap to a degree that could be compared, even from a distance, to what we find today.

But if the regulations of the trades were intended to develop independence of character, intelligence, morality, the happiness of craftsmen, these were indeed met there with full success. The worker who had risen through the ranks bit by bit, who was educated by travel, which was animated under

the auspices of the regional nobleman, pride for his art while working on his masterpiece, who got married only when he had been able to do so

241

wisely, and who from then on had felt the need to live up to his dignity as a father and master, was capable of quenching society's needs to a higher degree than a manufacturer could ever be (1).

Why would a master of a large factory, which does not service the art of living beyond his money, or at most his vigilance, be a more important character than these old masters were, who always worked themselves, whose workers were inferior to him in acquired knowledge, in education, in morality, in independence; or compared to journeymen companions, or even to apprentices as these are putting their time in working in the trades? The masters of manufactures hold, in the urban industries, the same status as the great landlords of the countryside. Like them, in order to raise their great fortune, they must remove one or two hundred small independent stakeholders; like them, they then reduce, in concert with one another, all the men who work for them, to a state approaching servitude; like them, by the great means at their disposal such as, the application of scientific expertise, an extended and more complete division of labor, the economy of time and inspection, they advance the art of industrialism, but push back the fate of men;

(1) The organization of the guilds, with its masteries in the trades, is still maintained in the Austrian Empire today, with some modifications that a suspicious government had to make. The latter, in fact, attributed to itself all the authority which, in the Middle Ages, belonged to corporate guilds. But it intended to keep all those who practice the useful arts in abundance, and it succeeded. We find in an English Revue (the Foreign Quarterly Review, No. 36, January 1837) a very well drawn picture of governmental policy, and the resources of that Empire. The author, who is entranced by the principles of the chrematistic school, deplores the obstacles which, through the control of the guilds, are imposed on trade and industry. "They arrest," he said, "to an unprecedented degree the development of national wealth; by putting an almost invincible obstacle to revolutions, or even to any innovations at all; to the effect that a stirring spirit hardly manifests itself except in the cities, and in Austria the cities are too much inclined to nourish the desire to change nothing in their country. The townspeople, en masse, must be seen," the author says, "as eager to defend a system which guarantees them a monopoly of commerce" (p. 294). So the same system, according to him, causes the ruin of industry and the ease of all those that it supports; the inhabitants of the cities seem to him to enjoy too great a material happiness, thanks to the masteries, to desire a revolution, or even improvements.

242

like them, finally, they experience a reaction when those that they employ begin to suffer, and they are ruined in turn by the fake economic operating system they have chosen to get rich by. It should never stop to amaze, that an organization of society which tends to destroy small properties, both in the industrial arts as in agriculture, and to replace it with poverty on the one hand, and opulence on the other; a system which creates boundless power for some, and for others an absolute dependence, a system which

tends to fight the idea or rather the dominant passion of this century, to wit equality, was precisely in this century welcomed with so much enthusiasm and ardor. And the astonishment redoubles when we realize that unnatural alliances were formed between the aristocracy of the useful arts and those who call themselves liberal, so that industrialism and a zeal for equality come together under the same flags.

As we have just represented them, the useful arts were practiced by trades rather than in factories; the consumer ordered the work which he needed, he had it done under his direction, and he paid for the job as soon as it was accomplished. This is still the way today in the mobile trades; the request generally precedes the work of the carpenter, the blacksmith, the mason, the shoemaker, and the tailor. However there were also, already in the Middle Ages, some proper manufactures. Such was the art of woolen fabrics, which was amassing so much wealth for a time and then spreading out from the main cities of Flanders, Lombardy and Tuscany; such was the case with the art of silk production, which has been preserved to last till the present day. There would no doubt be as much interest as instruction in studying the history of the art of woolen fabrics at the time of its greatest prosperity; as no factory has left more glorious monuments, and none has maintained a larger population in numerous abundance. The Cathedral of Florence, one of the most worthy of admiration in the Middle Ages, could be accomplished due to this work, and the consuls of the wool trade did not play a less glorious role in the political sphere than they did in the arts. But we don't believe that it is possible to gather sufficient information to fully understand how the wealth produced by

243

work was distributed so equally among all those who participated in this work, how the worker was protected against the power of the masters, how competition was limited between these latter, and how with a complicated organization and a mutual dependence of the members of a body which in a way formed a republic within the state, the liberty of all had been spared and the development of the industry had not been slowed down. It is easier to study the art of silk making, which is still preserved in Tuscany roughly as it existed in ancient society, and to see in it how a manufacture could therefore be entirely intended for trade, without being invaded. as it is today, by big capitalists; and without the fate of subjecting to a game of chance, all those whom it is providing a living to.

The silkworm, which in eighth or ninth century had been brought from Morea to Sicily,, was introduced into Tuscany two or three centuries later, when the republics of this region had established their freedom and began expanding their businesses. Mulberry trees were planted in great numbers all over the fertile countryside, and towards the end of June of each year a harvest of cocoons was delivered to a still scarce industry. In the following two months, boilers were in operation in several of the small towns, in the center of each district planted with mulberry trees, for separating the silk from the cocoons. Then it was transferred to more or less crude machines for spinning and twisting; then going to small manufacturers, who made

silk sheet goods or velvet; after which these fabrics were collected by the big silk merchants, in Florence and Lucca. These in turn either went themselves, or sent their associates to the fairs of Lyon, to the one in Troyes Champagne, and to all the major markets of Western Europe; and silk fabrics, despite their exorbitant price, found consumers there. Many things are worth looking at separately, regarding this first origin of a rich manufacture: the benefit that it brought to the country, the condition of the men who

244

participate in it, the nature of the capital employed to make it flourish, its circulation and the slowness of this circulation, the quantity of cash that it employed.

A factory, as we tried to make it understood, sometimes provides a profit haphazardly, and sometimes as the result of commercial means; that is to say that the one who gets richer through operating a factory sometimes appropriates the substance of the competition, through the hazards of the game in which both indulge, and sometimes the common fund of society really increases. The nature of the products is not sufficient to distinguish these two ways of pursuing a fortune. If we judged this by nature, one would be disposed to conclude that the silk factory did not create real wealth; because the fabrics, which it produced, did not add to useful value. They replaced woolen fabrics which would have done precisely the same function; they flattered the vanity of a few rich people, who previously satisfied this vanity just as well with already existing products. But at the time when silk manufacturing began, the people who were to provide it with a flow had increased. It was then that the feudal system flourished in Western Europe: each village had its castle; each castle contained a small courtyard; each lord, to increase his defenders, had distributed his lands to more peasants, and he had thus produced an increase in his rents. Revenue therefore preexisted among consumers, which he could appropriate as a luxury. Also, although silk was manufactured in a much more expensive way than it is today; the silkworm culture tended to comprise much less knowledge as to how to produce cheaply; the drawing, spinning, weaving, and dyeing, these all thrived, that is, each job was amply remunerated; it was at least as much, and often much better than in any other occupation. It is true that silk fabrics were sold by weight of gold. The great lord, who nowadays softens the appearance of the interior walls of his residences with silk draperies, believed then to deploy a great luxury when, on gala days, he could wear a velvet coat, or perhaps only one made from raw

245

silk; all those to whom he wished to inspire respect and admiration, were just as struck by his magnificence as they would be by that of a lord nowadays. For him the enjoyment was the same, and perhaps the expense was the same too.

Silk manufacturing therefore brought, in the thirteenth and fourteenth century, a profit to the Tuscans; but it is important to resolve a second question in regard to that: who were those who could take advantage of it? The answer is as good as it gets: all equally so. The price of cocoons was high enough that the most profitable of all agricultural products was the mulberry leaf, which was paid to the owner; so that the most lucrative occupation of the farmer was feeding his silkworms. For two months, each household in the country was occupied with this culture: men, women and children, each took from his sleep, from his leisure, the time required to care for these insects; but also each family saw increased ease by this supernumerary product in a way, and which was added to what it already possessed. No sooner had the cocoons been brought to the market than, in each village, two or three industrious entrepreneurs, after having bought a small stake in the venture, worked and made work drawing the silk from the boiling waters. Their work too lasted about two months; often they were assisted by a few women whom they had called up from the lower mountains, because at that time no work held them back in the fields there. A small part of the profit they shared with them to spread ease in their families throughout the year, and so helped the mountain people to endure the deprivations of the off season. The spinners then bought the silk. We had not yet invented the mechanism of the superb spinning mills, which were only built during the last fifty years. All silk had to be spun by the distaff or the spinning wheel; the operation was long, but it was done in their spare time by women, in all the urban families; they were well paid, however, each young lady always found her space in the interior of the domestic walls; it was a livelihood that was assured to them

246

even in economic bad years, and an honest woman was never, as today, reduced to not finding any work that could be done without neglecting her household chores, her family obligations, and modesty. The manufacturer finally bought the spun silk; he had it dyed on account for himself; woven at his loom, with his assistant, which he then sold at a profit to a merchant, who combined in his stores the products from perhaps a hundred different manufacturers. In the hands of the merchant, silk became the object of considerable speculation; he was ill-advised to resell and entrust such a considerable part of his fortune to others. More often than not he would be selling it himself at the large quarterly fairs in Western Europe. Thus the considerable profit, which the luxury expenses of the rich made it possible to obtain on the silk trade widely spread the ease, by a wage much higher than the common measure, among the peasants who raised the silkworms, the mountaineers who came to pull it from the boiling waters, the spinners at home, the dyers and the weavers. At the same time, silk manufacturing also offered a profit higher than the rate in the trade of common goods. This would tend to favor the contractors of boilers, fabric makers, and its merchants. The number of citizens, or the independent people, that this trade allowed them to live in ease was already considerable.

To better understand the effect of this ancient type of manufacturing on the general prosperity of countries, it must be compared, not only to what it is today, but to what we are striving to have it become; because right now, in Tuscany, it is in a state of transition.

The cultivation of silkworms in general, is still an industry abandoned to the peasants; however we are starting to try to take it away from them. The Tuscan Agricultural Society presented a petition that the silkworm, in the peasant's bedroom, would not find sufficient ventilation, nor a sufficient temperature, nor equally well cared for and understood, as when workers who raised them made it their only profession. As a result, intelligent wealthy, and generous citizens, but whose zeal, we believe, is the evil of their country, have

247

built, to the applause of the public, what is called 'bigattières' (1). These are large buildings, well distributed, well ventilated, where millions of silkworms are raised by wage-drawing workers. Everything is better understood in care, food, temperature, and change of litter; the silkworm certainly lives happier in the bigattière than in the peasants' homes; they are exposed to fewer diseases, and more cocoons are produced on the same amount of leaves. On the other hand, the worker paid by the day has only a mediocre interest in the success of his work; he just needs to be free of any blame. He neither observes carefully, nor extraordinary diligence or devotion should be expected of him. His work is making him less happy than the peasant, because his heart is not in it, he does not attach any hope for a better future; and consequently, it costs more to the one who rewards him, because all the incidentals of a worker's attitude are counted in the market price.

But the immediate effect of the bigattières was the introduction of market speculation, or, in other words, a hazardous arrangement, and a tendency to clutter. The peasants probably had no way of knowing the extent of the needs of the mercantile world, or competition that other silk-producing countries were doing to them, but they regulated themselves to a certain routine which sheltered them from violent shocks. They planted mulberry trees where their fathers had planted them; they increased their number, only when they made new clearings, so that all products increased in the same proportion.

The extent of their houses also regulated the quantity of silk-making worms that they could breed; it almost always evened out. The bigattières, on the contrary, gave a new impetus to production; the peasants did not abandon their old industry, so the effect of mastered silkworm breeding was that of an added new quantity to the former one. Very considerable plantations of mulberry trees have been ordered simultaneously in all the plains. Public opinion widely encouraged speculation; there were considerable profits on silk expected to be made. The manufacturing has

(1) From the name 'bigatti' given to the silkworm.

redoubled activity, but the price of cocoons was affected by fluctuations of opinion, much faster than those of needs; this year it is fifty percent lower than it was last year (1). Great fortunes have been won and lost on a game of chance that were to be produced by such big differences, but all these were just aleatory fortunes, which only passed from one person's wallet to another, and were of no benefit to the country whatsoever. However, if the general opinion is to be believed, the owners of bigattières find it difficult to pay the workers they employ even a meager wage; and, after having done more than enough harm to the peasants whom they have made into their rivals, they themselves are having great difficulty covering their costs at current market prices.

The work to which the silk is then subjected is still shared today between three independent industries, silk pullers, spinners, and weavers; but great efforts are being made to bring them together into one, and this uniting of jobs in one place cannot be far away. Silk pullers exist in large enough numbers in each of the small towns of Tuscany.

The boiler in which the cocoons are boiled, and from where the silk is reeled off or pulled, as the worm has spun it, is an inexpensive set up but one which gives off a great stench, and which probably is unsanitary. A very small amount of fixed capital, and a fairly limited circulating capital, are sufficient for silk pullers to buy cocoons, and to have the silk reeled off by workers he calls calls up from the mountains, during the two months that this work lasts. The wages of these workers are very low; the profit on the boilers is also, as we are assured, very limited. The unbleached silk is then purchased by

(1) The fall in the price of cocoons this year made everyone feel the difference between the two systems: the masters as well as the peasants, who did not speculate, who were content to have their own leaves eaten by their own worms, gained less than usual, but they lost nothing; those, on the contrary, who bought paper assets, who wanted to trade, exposed their capital to gambling, and they lost half of it.

the owners of the spinning mills; these are very beautiful and very large establishments which require a very considerable fixed capital. Their mechanism is very ingenious, but also are very expensive. Every day one hears of new improvements, and those about to adopt them enter into a ruinous competition with the older plants. The number of spinning mills is necessarily very restricted, and each one of them keeps a lot of women occupied; some inside, and others, an additionally large number, who take the work to be done, home with them. Their wages are still relatively high today, especially for the unwinding of the skeins onto reels. The benefits for spinners are thought to be considerable too; however we have been seeing a slew of bankruptcies quickly follow one another among them. Also, a new mechanism was introduced in Tuscany recently, for those who run spinning mills, using a waterfall; all the reeling work that women once

did in their homes is no longer necessary, and most of them have since been fired. Finally the weavers of silk fabrics are mainly gathered in the city of Florence, and a few of them have indeed raised great fortunes, all compromised today however by the same game to which commerce has recently been subjected to in America. At the same time a Russian, whose colossal fortune as well as his pompous behavior have been astonishing in Europe for a long time, proposed to create, in the palace that his father had erected for his residence near Florence, the most prodigious silk factory that has ever existed. All the various industries of pullers, reelers, spinners, weavers, and dyers will be gathered there; all works will be carried out within the same enclosure, without anything taken to be done outside. Steam power will be employed to create artificial waterfalls. All its works will be carried out by employees, all will be managed by inspectors in his employ; the profit or loss will henceforth be for him alone, because no one else will be able to compete with him. Existing workshops will have to be closed, demolished, or devoted to some other industry. His gigantic design today excites admiration. It is ensured that, by the power of its capital, by the perfection of its machines, by the economy of its centralization, it will produce higher quality fabrics, lower in price than those of Lombardy, Piedmont, or Lyon.

250

He will be, as long as his power lasts, the only representative, or nearly so, of the Tuscan silk industry in its entirety, the only one who will be reaping its benefits. But if he is ruined, or if, discouraged by losses, he gives up his business, he will leave all the workers he has assembled out on the street, after having deprived them of any resource other than himself. Silk manufacturing in Tuscany, as compared to how it was when it was first introduced, is thus infinitely more extensive; its products are perhaps forty times greater in quantity, but their value is hardly more than four times larger, and the number of workers it maintains has hardly doubled. The disproportion between these advances is the necessary consequence of their nature; we managed to make all processes more economical and thus lowering their prices; but we could only achieve this by having the work done with the help of waterfalls, not human forces. The fabrics are more flexible, more varied, but less strong, less durable and, above all, less beautiful. In the country, the consumption of silk is a little more extensive, in so far as it replaced wool and hemp; it would be difficult to say if any increase in enjoyments resulted from that; this advantage, if it exists at all, will moreover be especially taken in by foreigners, since by far most of the products are exported. As for its producers, silk manufacturing no longer spreads its benefits on a class that is as large as it used to be, limiting it to a wage of ordinary work; the number of independent decision makers, those who worked without needing to be supervised by some master, has decreased infinitely; finally, the fate of all has become more precarious, and we can already foresee the fatal and near term of their career.

We will take advantage of the foregoing statements of facts to consider the silk factory from a third point of view, that of the capital that is committed to it, and of its nature.

251

In the first beginnings of this manufacture, one does not notice its capital. The cultivator, the silk puller, the spinner, the weaver, advance it in such small parts, that they themselves do not realize even that they have it. The cultivator advances the leaf which the insects eat, and with his own labor; if, to establish them, he sometimes is obliged to buy some trellis for that, his expense go up only by a few pennies that he took out of his food, and did not notice. Most often he pays nothing, with no cash coming out of his pocket. However his work, and his sustenance, and the mulberry leaf used as feed, has a price.

The owner of a 'bigattiere' realizes this immediately when he wants to pursue this industry on its own. The disbursements to buy the leaves, and to pay wages to his workers, amount to two-thirds, often to four-fifths of the money he later recovers from the cocoons. Thus the first circulating capital, advanced at the origin of the manufacture, was not money, but allocated time and labor, which were not even appreciated. Today this is not more money, although it is imagined as such, but time and trouble, which are only appreciated as such.

The owner of the bigatière started by building it; no not with cash money, because he did not have a full strongbox of it, but with some intangible capital, some claim that by carrying out his building plans he would be getting paid later, thus creating one favor for another, by borrowing. This capital did not exist in anyone's hands, in the form of ecus, previously; and after the loan is granted only for a small number of days, often only for a small number of hours, in his own hands.

As for his circulating capital, if he wants to keep track of his account, it will have to pass to the flow of its cocoons, the value of the leaves which he collect himself, the rent that his bigatière should be worth, the food of his servants and workers, and their wages. These are the only ones he pays in money, with ecus he had often received the day before. However all of its advances take the name of ecus, and must be reimbursed with profit; in ecus, by the one who buys his

252

cocoons: most often, in turn, he discards these liabilities the next day. The silk puller begins his operation with ecus; he spends a small number of them to build his boiler, another part goes toward buying the cocoons, others yet to buy the fuel and to pay the wages of his workers. This is not by any means however all of his capital; he must among all these advances account for his own work and supervision. These aggregate advances must be reimbursed to him by the one to whom he will be selling his silk to. But the operation of a silk puller hardly lasts longer than two months; thus he would incur a considerable loss if he were to hold his ecus idle, from the end of August when he sells his silks, until the beginning of July when he

buys back cocoons; so he never does. Either he borrows the money, using his boilers as collateral, or he lends whatever he withdraws, by selling, for example, his silk on credit, his capital, during ten months, is immaterial; it only exists in the form of receivables. For two months, on the contrary, he speedily and successively makes good on what this money represents, his cocoons, fuel, food for workers, boiled-down silk, and finally, additional money; the ecus circulate, but they just pass quickly through the hands of the silk puller.

The silk spinner buys the puller's silk with ecus, the weaver buys the spun silk, the wholesaler buys the woven fabrics, the dealer buys them from the merchant to resell them to the consumer, who ultimately has to reimburse all advances, all wages, all benefits with the same ecus that he himself received a short time before as wages for his work, as a profit from his industry, or as a rent from his land. The capital which circulates in these various stages of the manufacturing process is already considerable, and having given heed that we were to give an idea of its movement, we next thought we had to take the opportunity to focus attention on the role that money played there, and on the nature of this modification of wealth, so often confused with it, which we call circulating capital. Already we can recognize that this is an intangible quantity, a value that the imagination appreciates, and which is found in ever new forms in the commodity, as its production developed.

In another essay, we will follow this analysis, and we will draw some consequences; but here we only want to take advantage of the fact that, with the mutual relationship between the branches of the silk factory still being fresh in our memory and in making it clear how the transformations of the various aspects of circulating capital operate, true enough, with the help of money, but that the ecus nevertheless form only one very small part of it all.

In the beginnings of silk manufacturing, when each operation was carried out independently, still with crude implements, and adapted to the forces of a single man, each worker could get a good advance of his capital in cash, but it was for a very short time, so as to repeat the operation several times a year. So the spinner bought the raw silk pound by pound, or even ounce by ounce, and he sold it on to the weaver as soon as he had spun it, often at the end of the same week. Perhaps he never had more than a single ecu at the same time, and this one ecu was yet enough to buy 50 ecus of raw silk during the year, which he then resold for 100 ecus of spun silk. The weaver acted in much the same way, he also had but little money; he bought the spun silk needed to make a piece of cloth, which he then sold to the merchant before starting a second. The merchant needed capital, as well as a larger sum of ecus, because his stores were filling up with pieces of cloth awaiting there the flow of sales at quarterly fairs. But although every piece of cloth would have been bought with money, it was far from true that the merchant would ever have in his coffers an amount of money equal to the value of the goods he would have had in his store,

because he had not purchased his inventory all at once, but while selling he never let substantial amounts of money sleep in his safe, but instead redeeming it immediately for new merchandise.

Let us return, however, to the main purpose of this Essay: what can be

254

done for the happiness of those who practice the useful arts? If someone would be answering: Putting more circulating capital or more cash at their fingertips, we would ask him to wait with drawing his conclusions, until we have defined the nature of these two changes in wealth, better. If some other person suggested a return to the ancient organization of the industrial arts and crafts, under which it seems certain that the craftsmen enjoyed much more ease, security, and consideration towards their well-being than today's manufacturers do, we would reply that the world never takes back the fetters it had put in place; as all the privileges of the guild corporations had been abolished with cries of triumph, as if it was a victory of the poor classes over the rich; and never mind that guilds had all been invented for the protection of the poor, and they benefited only them.

However even the poor themselves would never consent to a retrograde movement, and perhaps they would be right; habits are taken on, manners are changed, new interests have developed, and a great suffering threatens those who suddenly would see themselves cut off from being able to enter occupations that are freely entered today.

Since the cries of distress from the new industrialism began to make it understood that all was not progress in the so much admired development of manufactures, we also began to propose to remunerate workers by fully participating in the profits of a manufacturing company. We would indeed welcome with joy any means of associating proletarians with ownership, to bring them back from a status of mechanical agents to that of thinking beings endowed with a will. But we have to admit, as things have been developing, that we have no confidence this expedient would be workable. Profit sharing as such would by no means remedy the greatest of plagues weighing today on industry, which is congestion, and the rivalry of all to produce always more and better for selling on the market. It would leave commerce and manufacturing exposed to this extensive and terrible game, which nowadays so often ruins merchants, and also taking away all the small savings of the poor workers associated with the company. Finally,

255

and this is our main reason, we have no confidence in those who exercise delegated powers. We believe that any corporation won't do its business as well as those who are driven by individual interest; that from directors, there will be negligence, pompousness, squandering, favoritism, and a fear of compromising oneself, all the same faults that we have remarked on being prevalent in the administration of public assets, in opposition to that of a private fortune. We believe furthermore, in a meeting of shareholders, one will find only negligence, inattention, caprice, and that any mercantile

enterprise would be constantly compromised and soon ruined, if it were to depend on a deliberative assembly and not from a merchant owner.

What can be done though, to remedy the evils already so serious in the present, and which seem to us to become even more formidable in the future? We have said it before, we only know of palliatives. The first, the most important, it is to enlighten the opinion: the second, not to give more encouragement to new inventions; the third, to keep large capital out of industrial enterprises. If these three palliatives, because we agree that these should not be seen as anything else, were administered with constancy and intelligence, we do not believe that they would remain ineffective.

There is a power of habit in the human character, or, if you like, a force of inertia which, very often, has been an anchor of security on society. This inertial force has long rejected the manufactures' game of winner take all. Everyone following the routine of his profession, has been perfecting and slowly enlarging it, but without attempting revolutions in industry. It is the governments which, especially for the last half of a century, have believed that they had no more important business than to promote the industrial arts, commerce, and manufactures. They were the ones who repeatedly told their subjects that it was a shame to remain dependent on foreigners, who pushed them into exporting, which made a general prosperity depend on producing a lot and consuming little, exporting a lot, and not re-import anything.

256

They were not satisfied with exhortations or even with rewards offered to all new inventions, all imports of processes to speed up work; they put industry in a greenhouse in each state, they forced it into a premature development; their whole customs system, all their commercial treaties, and the greater part of their diplomatic relations tended to the same end. Even today, now that the suffering of their subjects should make them think, they are becoming more and more active following the same path. Pasha who would like to civilize Egypt, or the Czar who would like to barbarize Europe, do it in the same way. Each year they increase the number of their factories by the most direct action of power; and at the same time, England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, and Italy, are redoubling efforts to ever further extend their markets into foreign countries. Mercantile greed no doubt is no stranger to the crisis that is being experienced in Europe today; but if it had been left to its own strengths it might have calmed down by now; at least the congestion under which we are suffocating would not have manifested itself for such a long time.

If once it were well recognized and clearly demonstrated that consumption can only increase with an increase in revenue; that any effort to under-sell rivals, so as to found the prosperity of a new factory on the ruination of an already established one, is both unjust and immoral, whether one proposes the desolation of foreign or domestic rivals; that this unnatural conduct cannot escape long-term punishment by increasing a bulk in output, but concomitant decrease of wages, prices, profits, and by the misery of all;

that labor savings produce a negative national profit or loss, inasmuch as all the work saved results in it being unemployed. If, finally, it would be recognized that the purpose of political economy and the action of good government concerns the happiness of each and every

257

person, not the accumulation of things. We can flatter ourselves that this disastrous action of government, its pushing toward industrialism would cease as a consequence; that then also all its agricultural and industrial companies would stop offering prices, as fully endorsed by the political-economy academe, to whoever would thereby most disturb the necessary balance between production and consumption, to whoever would make human labor more useless as a result; with workers, only having their jobs to live on, more supernumerary. So that finally, the generous citizens, the patriots, would no longer believe that they were serving their countries by renouncing for themselves a life of moral developments and intellectual pleasures; to create so-called wealth, which ceases to be such as soon as their exchangeable value decreases with the increase in their quantity.

We trust in the power of truth and reason, to remedy current ills; however, we do not invoke it alone. It has been observed that the violent shocks that the manufacturing industry is experiencing today are due to the speed with which scientific discoveries are following one another, and their lucrative application, makes it into the industrial arts on the largest scale.

The incessant succession of useful inventions, astonishing as it is, today is causing a reaction on consumption itself. No one is happy with what is, waiting for what is yet to come; nobody wants to stock up on things that are produced by the latest discovery, because the consumer has no doubts not that before two years, before six months perhaps, a new discovery will replace it with something either more convenient or more economical.

Each buyer can observe this change in his provisions for himself; but when one looks at the seller, the convulsions his activities bring to bear on the public fortune are truly astonishing. Not only are the values of all goods already produced halved by the invention, which halves the value of the work that went into it, but all the whole experience of the workers, the whole yield of their learning is destroyed; all fixed capital, all machines that have become more expensive every day, are rendered useless; even the land itself, on which these are located, can be

258

sacrificed in turn. We were delighted with the invention of beet sugar, as having shaken the system of slavery; but let's ignore this shameful and criminal means of exploitation which was not necessary for the colonies, and let us measure the ruin that such an innovation brings to the former industry. European sugar, destroyed the sugar culture of the West Indies, destroyed all the sugar mills, refineries, factories of all kinds, which were exploiting cane juice in the islands. It destroyed the territorial value of all plantations, it rendered the entire farming population useless, it put an end

to all transport trade in this commodity. Who knows how long it will be before an invention, not any more surprising, will teach us how to make wine without grape juice, in any climate, and in any season? Will this invention not ruin all vineyards and all winegrowers? Who knows what will be the latest result of the invention of steam transport machines, like harvesters, trains, and boats; and what effect will the suppression of the greater part of the beasts of burden then have on agriculture? Who can measure the consequences, in human terms, for society of so many other revolutionary inventions of some sort, being contemplated by so many heads working at the same time?

However, we in no way propose to stop, nor to circumscribe the genius of man, busily mastering nature, but we believe that the time has passed when there was some advantage to excite him with rewards. We watch the awarding of patents, granting a monopoly to an industrial discovery, as a dangerous encouragement giving a wrong direction to the sciences. This is not about money making, it is not especially to earn it at the expense of industrious men whose ruin it causes, as to why scientists seek to uncover the secrets of nature. May he continue his research, may he obtain the glory reserved for the philosopher, but may no greed come to distract him from his natural inclination; that no monopoly is guaranteed to him for a application of science to the industrial arts, which we do not reject, if it arrives slowly and without tremor, but which, shielded with the privilege, as it is granted today, shakes every part of the industrial edifice in turn,

259

and can upset the social order itself.

Finally, the great revolutions in the industrial world, the creation of a new industry to the detriment of the older ones, the unexpected production of a mass of commodities that condemns the established producers to idleness, the construction of machines of prodigious strength, chasing workers out of their workshops by the thousands. Finally there is the aleatory frame of mind, the spirit of the game of chance introduced into all branches of commerce, first into speculating on raw commodities, then in the search for new markets, in the effort to awaken new fantasies, in all the parts of this overexcited trade, at home or abroad, for which the English term is 'over-trading'; all these mishaps in current industry activity are due to a disproportionate capital use regarding a single company. Bankruptcies brought on by the crisis in America have taught us that it was often on a fund of a million, or a million and a half sterling, with which the great English trading houses worked. Without a doubt, with a sum as prodigious as thirty or forty million francs, one must acquire in most markets a large enough influence, to be able to ruin at will all the more modest industries. This dependence of small enterprises with regard to the big ones is very much a political misfortune too, although economical. The millions of sterling are no less disastrous to commerce than the Roman 'latifundia' were to agriculture. In either way, we cannot raise the fortune of a great lord but by sacrificing a hundred large, or a thousand small independent fortunes. In one as in the other case, the destruction of the modest ease of

the great number does not ensure the prosperity of the opulent merchant, or the opulent owner. Negligence, dissipation, all the vices attached to a boundless power, more than offset all the advantages of monopoly; and bankruptcies are no more rare among the Croesus of commerce than they are among humble merchants.

260

We believe that the state can do much to divert big capitalists from a path on which they embark causing nothing but disorder and dangers, both for themselves and for others. We believe that the sovereigns, instead of rewarding manufacturers and merchants, who have the merit of being enormously rich, with titles and other dignities, would use their business ties more effectively by avoiding speculative deals. We believe that instead of allowing tax favors in foreign trade and in all matters financial as attached to high opulence, these should be just and should ensure that a million sterling, which represents the capital of say a thousand families, pay less to the tax authorities than the million sterling which forms the capital of a single one. We finally believe that the law of inheritances, and an equal sharing between sons and daughters, can remedy this frightful accumulation of property; and that these goals must never be lost sight of by the legislator.

But it is not always with the fortune of an individual that large commercial or industrial enterprises are founded. The art of employing foreign capital has come a long way in our century; the art of, as they say, mobilizing fortunes, is one of the inventions that modern chrematistics welcomes. If public opinion once recognizes all the dangers attached to this great game of capital mobility, if it monitors the speculations of the capitalists with at least as much distrust as the land grabbing of the great lords in the past, it will become easy to put limits on the action of these fictitious capitalists, these capitalists born by association; for these are creatures of the law, and they are governed by it. Thus the nature and guarantees of sponsorships by the State, the conditions of the limited companies owned by shareholders, the creation of banks, and all the facilities they provide for employing the greatest capitals, are some of many questions which have been treated by economists, in their relations with government legislation, as if the great goal of the statesman was to accumulate capital, and remove any and all obstacles to which capitalists are subjected to. While, from our

261

point of view, the legislator must be guided above all by the desire to prevent mishaps, to destroy any hazardous disposition, within society; guided by the desire to multiply small fortunes at the expense of large ones, and to make the economy prevail everywhere, acting like a father of the family countering the speculations of the mercantile association. For the moment we see no point in continuing with the application of these principles; we feel that these would lead us towards completely new subjects, and discussions of those for which we have not prepared our

readers. It is enough for us to have shown that the evils to which those who practice the useful arts are exposed do not seem to us to be without remedies, and that the remedies we offer are not illegal, that there isn't anything strange about them, nothing revolutionary, and nothing visionary either, nor that it would require a total reorganization of society.

Above all, we feel only the need to make our readers fully aware of the idea that what is important to the progress of science is to know the truth, and never to fear to contemplate it in all its bareness, just because it could be distressing. That what matters is to really know what good or what bad things industrialism has been doing to industrial man; because it is up to us as to how human society is to be organized. We are always its masters, obliged to stop its action when it causes great suffering; and we are not permitted to resign ourselves, by rejecting the responsibility of our actions based on a false fatality, to be causing the misfortune of others.

262

SIXTEENTH ESSAY

The Numeraire, Circulating Capital, and Banks.

It is not strange that the Greeks attributed to gods, sons of gods, or other unworldly heroes, the invention of institutions on which human society is based. Most institutions, in fact, require such an accurate and profound knowledge of the essence of things, a knowledge which at the same time is acquired before these very things existed, that one can't help but attribute it to beings of a higher nature, or otherwise to see it as a kind of revelation. We sense an impossibility of such institutions somehow gradually having developed; it always seems that the very thing that was to be created, was a necessity so that we could create it. How to explain, before language, the convention from which linguistic syntax was born? How, without signs for thought, was it possible to arrive at this most subtle analysis of the operations of the human mind, on which grammar rests? How to explain this admirable decomposition of sounds, which has allowed them to be represented by letters, before letters had given men the means of using the thoughts of each other, and while each thinker was still reduced to individual efforts? How to understand the search for metals, before any metal was in use? The prodigious work in the mines without the aid of any metallic implement; the search, in the bowels of the earth, for metallic limestone, before any experience had taught one how this seemingly useless ore could be

263

converted, by the power of fire and with water, into a malleable bonding agent for stone? How with iron and copper, which we had never seen before in any refined state, would we make tools; while nothing that man

had seen on earth could in advance have given him the idea? The search for precious metals, gold and silver, is even more extraordinary. On the one hand, as they are infinitely rarer, they also had to be much more difficult to discover; their refining required the most extensive knowledge in metallurgy, while their use was much more limited than that of iron. If we were not to make more than shiny ornaments with them, this use did not seem to be a sufficient motive to undertake all these peculiar works without which it was impossible to obtain them.

But what is even more remarkable than the extraction of precious metals from the ore that concealed them, is the social use we proposed to make of them and which alone, today, gives them their price. This use, so as to the invention of coins, requires the most admirable appreciation in order to get to conceive future relationships between men; which usage, without yet fully understanding it as of today, continuously has been happening now for three or four thousand years,

From the moment that exchanges were introduced between men, whose occupations were divided, and where each worked, not for himself, but for society; waiting for compensation for his own work from society in return, the concept of utility in the appreciation of things gave way to that of exchangeable values. Utility was the appreciation of things, by each individual, on the assumption that he would make use of it himself; the value was the appreciation rendered by society as a whole, by comparing the desire of purchasers, relevant to their means to obtain them.

The value was further the comparative appreciation of the thing evaluated, not with a particular thing, but with everything. Value is therefore a social idea put to stand in for an individual idea; it is, moreover, an abstract idea put in the place of a positive idea. It's a comparison

264

between unknown quantities, for which the mind seems to have had to proceed by the algebraic method rather than arithmetic, but which was contemplated at a time when neither algebra nor arithmetic existed. Simultaneously with the idea of value, the one of a numeraire, which was its complement, developed. The habit of working, not for oneself, but to wait for unknown buyers, had made it necessary to consider everything marketable under two different aspects; to recognize two values, of which a merging into one was necessary. On the one hand, it was necessary in fact to measure the price of production or the entire compensatory labor, and all the advances that an object had cost to produce, with the legitimate profits that any industry should be able to procure; on the other hand, it was necessary to estimate the market price, or the compensation that the consumer is prepared to give to get that same thing. Sometimes these two prices leave a very great difference between them, either because the production is too expensive to sell with an added profit, or, contrariwise, consumers have other needs that are too pressing, or perhaps they are having difficulty in obtaining the thing that they want, bidding each other out, and paying far in excess for the thing than it cost to produce. The fixing of these two prices, the asking price of the seller, and the offer from

the buyer, may be the main consequence of commercial dealings; which most directly required one to introduce a numeraire into these exchanges, or the numeration in aliquot parts of all things that men considered to be having a value.

The value, or the relation between the demand for all and the production of all, was only susceptible of comparison as long as the mind grasped an ideal unity, and when, comparing objects to each other, one could answer one another how many times each of the compared objects contained this unit.

This abstract operation was an image of the one having been made with respect to material quantities, when weights were compared. Then also an ideal unit was chosen, the pound of weight, with the help of which one measured one of the properties of matter, that all different items or bodies had in common.

265

The analogy between the two ideas was felt to be so well fitting, that the the same name generally designates the two units intended for identifying it; one being the weight, and the other the value of everything.

The talent, the drachma, the ace, the denarius, the pound, the ounce, are all names of measures of weight as well as of measures of value. A piece of iron or stone was used to represent a pound of weight; a piece of gold, silver, or copper were used to represent a pound of value. But the idea of weight, the idea of value predates that of the base metal, or the stone that was used to measure one of the properties of matter, as in the idea of the precious metal which served to measure the other. Abstraction had been made present to the senses by an image, but it nevertheless existed independently from the image. Value was no more created by the pound of silver than gravity was created by the pound of weight that was used to measure it. Say an object weighed a hundred pounds, that is to say that by weight it was equal to one hundred times the piece of iron which was used to measure gravity's influence. If another one instead was worth a hundred pounds, its producer would be considering it as equal to one hundred times the compensation for the labor required to get hold of a pound of silver; and that the consumer would give, in order to obtain it, a hundred times the compensation he would give to get a pound of silver; and by uniting these appreciations, by rectifying them one by another, to say that such and such an object was worth a hundred pounds, was equal to saying that its exchangeable property was equal to one hundred times that of the piece of silver which was used to count pounds of value.

We sense how difficult it is to grasp this abstract idea, but we also know that this difficulty is further enhanced by the ambiguity of language, and by the habit our minds have adopted to consider the numeraire of things to count itself as really included in the things it is used for to count. We still assume the ecus as preexisting for the creation of the commodity, of fixed capital, of the land, of claims that we assess by them in general; while on the contrary, the value of all these things preexists before the ecus did, and

that the latter did not create those things any more than geometry creates the surfaces of an object.

But before following the progress of ideas according to which a numeraire was chosen as the measure of values, we must rest our mind again on the

266

double appreciation of the values themselves, on this balance of a seller's price with a buyer's price, mentioned incidentally before, and from which the market price results.

We tried to make it understood in our 13th Essay (p. 160), how commerce causes utility, the essence of wealth, to disappear; and allowing only their accidental nature, their exchangeable value to be its indicator. Before the introduction of commerce, when no one thought otherwise than to supply oneself, any increase in the quantity of produced things meant a direct increase in wealth. The amount of labor, as the cost of which this useful thing had been acquired, did not matter then. The father of a family felt twice as rich when his granaries were twice as full, even though the good harvest had not cost more work than a bad one had required; his wife also felt twice as rich when she saw herself in the possession of twice as much fabrics, without considering that this cloth could have been made, using a perfected loom, in half the time. After all, the desired thing loses nothing of its usefulness, even when, in order to obtain it, no extra work was needed; wheat and fabrics would not be any less useful to their owners, even if they would have been found on their way, even if they would have fallen to them from the sky. Utility and enjoyment comprise, without any doubt, the true appreciation of wealth. But from the moment when men gave up supplying their own needs, replacing each one of them by a dependence of their subsistence on the exchanges they could make with others, or from commercial dealings, they forced on themselves another attachment to appreciating values, to that of exchangeable value; to a value no longer resulting from utility, but from the relationship between the needs of society as a whole and the amount of work that was sufficient to satisfy such needs, and even to the needs that it will be able to satisfy in the future. This exchangeable price, this market price, is

267

among the most abstract-laden ideas ever presented by economic science. In the appreciation of the values that we have sought to measure through the institution of a numeraire, the notion of utility was put absolutely aside. It's the work, or the effort required to get two things exchanged for one another, that alone entered into consideration. It is on this basis that the seller's demand as well as buyer's offer took a hold of value. The first one will perhaps assert that the thing cost him ten days of work; but if the other recognizes that it henceforth be can accomplished in eight days of work, and if the competition demonstrates this to the two contenders, the result will be only eight days at which the market price will be established. And while it is true enough that both contracting parties subscribe to the

notion that the thing is useful, that it is desirable, that without desire there would be no sale; its pricing does not retain any relation to that utility. To measure the weight of a thing, it was never difficult to find a standard gauge with an always identical weight; it was an appreciable quantity for the senses. But, to measure values, it was necessary to find a standard whose value was also fixed; but the value of it however was an abstract quantity, a quantity that the senses could not appreciate. Therefore, while there was an analogy between the invention of pounds of weight and that of pounds of value, no full parity was achievable; before establishing how many pounds of wheat one could get for a pound of silver, it was first of all necessary to realize what the value of a pound of silver was, and so the answer was not an easy one to give. However, as we have just seen, the mercantile value is always fixed, in final analysis, on the amount of work required to procure the thing assessed; it is not the one it currently costs, but the one it would cost anew, with perhaps perfected means⁹, and this

9 Translator's footnote: Sismondi is right here, but in a way quite different from what he held to be the essential reason. As was mentioned in the translator's preface, no economy can exist without it being able to ongoingly replace itself. This means that those currently working on replacing its means of production at the rate of it being used up, and that, by forming a later generation of it, will produce future final output of an improved nature, are having their disbursed income available for purchasing final output at present, to which they lack any direct claim in terms of its embedded labor. This, in a nutshell, is how our economy works in a dynamic-equilibrium reality; thus not in the production of material things, as Sismondi rightly noted, but, because these are indeterminate in value at any present and as such aren't able to be conceived to exist *in* time, as a system of non-material accounts that always happens to be in an overlapping mode of debt to itself. A debt that will be resolvable *over* time when all its currently received, both direct and indirect, production remunerations reciprocally resolve the earlier embodied charges of wages, rents, profits, taxes, and depreciation allowances. This means not only that different versions of the same product (material 'things') are involved in embodiment and resolution, but also that each group of income earners will need to do its *own* resolution*; after all at least in the long term, consuming, or perhaps better said the clearing of the retail market being the economy's determinant, every income earner does so for him or herself. It also indicates that a (Marxist) non-profit economy isn't efficiently compatible with one having a natural tendency to grow through a 'learning-by-doing' process; as markets could not clear.

Meanwhile, in consideration of the economy's end purpose, its produced things don't have a determinate reality as yet; in its meaning of a solidly existing footing from which to produce anew. Furthermore, an out of thin air creatable numeraire isn't even a thing**, let alone a something that is endowed with beneficial causal properties. Once having to deal with it in terms of a system of fully integrated accounts for a preset purpose, with the latter meaning that a different and higher level is involved, the money numeraire cannot be independently causal on a lower level all by itself to as such bypass all the ramifications set on that higher level; regardless delusions of conventional economic theories. It's sole remaining fundamental attribute therefore is that of an induced non-material measuring unit of those accounts; which as such could be understood as analogous to the means to control an at all times imbalanced bicycle on a path from here to there, but never as any end in itself. If the latter is sought, and in combination with some institutionalized power, it will sabotage the system as a whole; negating any sense of economy.

* The most notable consequence being that, in the reality of economic continuity and a (final) demand-side determinant, an inverse proportionality between wages and profits is only an illusion. For what would the logical source of profits be for a single

quantity, even though difficult to immediately appreciate, is always established as being sufficiently fixed through competition. This is how the value of the pound of silver was found, and it was used to measure all other values. The silver pound represented the number of working days, by means of which it could be extracted from the mine, and bring it to the

268

place where it was to be exchanged; which is a number unknown to each of those who stipulate its value, but that society nevertheless appreciates, according to the reciprocal effort of donors and recipients. No account was taken of the utility of silver, and indeed, except as a coined currency, its usefulness is very limited; nor do we any longer take into account at all the work by which silver was previously drawn from the mine (because it may have been around for perhaps a hundred or two hundred years), but only the work it would take today to extract an equal amount. Any discovery of more abundant mines, or more economical processes for ore reduction, not only makes for a more abundant silver market, but at the same time makes all silver money lose some of its pre-existing value. However, experience has taught that this quantity, extracted each year by commercial mines, does not vary significantly. and hardly exceeds that which is every year is

capitalist owning it all?

** Creating a positively valued material 'thing' out of nothing, in our physical world, hasn't happened since the "big bang"; regardless of what economists (and financiers) may want you to believe. And so the money supply (a supply of non-things?) is another illusion; the same goes for acquiring a velocity, or anything M (and particularly M') is supposed to stand for. Instead it has to become understood that money, as strictly being a unit of account, gets created as a non-material to be resolved *debt*; and that it doesn't matter whether this occurs through a purposeful loan at a chartered bank, or by enticing someone to accept a cost-plus price for some additional material output. In the latter case it will be the 'plus' part that is "money" creating, placing the onus on its receiver to directly or indirectly spend (as opposed to withdrawing it into the financial "asset" market) and thereby reproach equilibrium, to assure as such a continuity in growth and thus is conditional; given that existing remunerations were already canceling each other out, so that at least an aggregate reproduction could continue. With either action, new economic activity becomes legitimized; but only a failure in already acquired-debt resolution would curtail such activity. Paying off previously granted loans only alters final-output distribution, in that rentiers-financiers no longer can participate in obtaining their share.

In the final analysis though, it is the economy's creditors, and those endowed with some form of monopoly power, who will need to take responsibility for their part of an acquired aggregate debt resolution; for, regardless of how those "powerful" creditors expect an economic continuity to happen, debtors *cannot* possibly accomplish this by themselves.

The choice is obvious – stick to a dynamic economy's perceived complexity, as based on static first principles with a ditto point of departure, and muddle on till some super-duper quantum computer endowed with AI will hopefully sort it all out sometime in the distant future, or, like Sismondi, embrace a *purposefully* existing dynamism at an economy's core with dynamic first principles; and have Mondragón lead the way to an *earned* prosperity for all, starting from right now, without needing to fear Damocles' sword dropping at any one time, just because we don't understand what's going on in the reality we ourselves created.

used up by the arts; and furthermore the discoveries in metallurgy have not been so rapid or so important, so as to appreciably decrease the quantity of labor that is required to produce the precious metal; and that finally the pound sterling, without being always identical in value, does approach this identity well enough, to be a good gauge of values, and to represent to the imagination a quantity of productive work that is always the same. A standard of measurements for weights, for surfaces, and for capacities, might very well be useful for a people as a whole; and indeed, in several town halls, one kept in the past the banal measure to which each one had recourse, before the custom was established to keep one at each home. It would not have been an absolute impossibility that a pound of silver also served as a common measure of values for a people as a whole; it would then only have represented to the senses this ideal unity of values to which we would have brought back the value of goods; but these

269

would then be transmitted from hand to hand, and exchanged, without, the intermediary of precious metals. We can even say that something similar is already happening in countries where there is established giro banking. All transactions relating to values are carried out using pieces of paper, which serve only to simplify the accounts; while the standard of values, which presents this abstract appreciation to the senses, is kept in a public deposit, and to which one can still resort using those same pieces of paper.

Commerce can, at the very least, be carried out after the mere fixation of this abstract unit of values, in which the value of all the things we want to compare is resolved, without even presenting the image to the senses, without giving a name to whatever represents something whose value is known.

It is assuredly so that there are still some semi-savage peoples who engage in trade without any numeraire other than an ideal currency, thus proving to us that the power to understand abstract quantities well, precedes all the progress of civilization. Commerce is rarely just an exchange of a thing desired by one against a thing desired by another; most often the two contractors do not have the intention to apply the thing for use of the one who does the exchange, but rather to bring it to a place where, by a new exchange, it will satisfy more desires or pressing needs. The merchants of the pastoral peoples arrive on the border of agricultural peoples, with the intention of trading horses, camels, pelts, dairy products, that their compatriots had been producing beyond their needs, against grains, salts, and some products from the urban workshops, which they will distribute on their return among their compatriots again. Even when they do not use precious metals for this exchange, they still need a numeraire, that is to say an ideal unit of value which they relinquish, in order to compare that what they are giving and what they will receive, to haggle and recognize instantly if they win or lose in the course of their negotiations. Such an object divides in their eyes into ten aliquot parts; eight of these parts is equivalent to the value of some other object, twelve of those to a third,

four of those to a fourth; and these aliquots are for them the means of enumeration.

270

‘Nummi’, the ideal currency. Whether or not there are physical ecus which represent them, whether these ecus are abound or they disappear entirely, the value of the things which are compared in such terms does not change more than their weight would be changed by the absolute disappearance of balances and spring-loaded scales.

The manufacture of precious metals into ecus however, each of which is actually equal in value to one of those aliquots between which the value of each thing has been divided, have made it possible to give commerce an extra facility.

The operation of the merchants of the pastoral people, who came to trade with the agricultural people, had no objective to buy or sell in terms of precious metals, but to take foreign goods into their country which were worth as many ideal pounds as those goods they had exported were worth; to sell them there for a greater sum of these same ideal currencies, so as to put themselves in a position to buy, with only a portion of their revenues, as many domestic goods as they had exported the previous year, and to use the remainder of the ideal currencies of which they would be creditors to their fellow citizens, or to procure enjoyments with and either raise their annual consumption, or to raise their fortunes.

The merchants of the agricultural people, who traded with them, on their part, made up precisely the same account of the situation; moreover, it is precisely the same that, since the introduction of the monetary pounds, is still being done today. The exchange of goods from one country with those of another country, or at least with those of all other countries in general, is almost always done on an equal footing. It would only be under some exceptional circumstances, whereby one of the countries would remain a debtor of the other, and more exceptionally yet which would cause one of the countries to pay the other an outstanding balance in specie. As for the profits in foreign trade, it is realized by the sales made by the re-importing merchant, to his compatriot consumers.

271

Only through this sale is it possible to recognize whether he really served the conveniences of that consumer, if he has brought him the item that this client is willing to pay more than it has cost the merchant.

Commerce is thus always an exchange of one commodity against another commodity; the invention of an ideal money only dispensed with always needing to find objects of the same value, to exchange them. One of the merchants delivers thirty or forty objects, each of which has a different value; the other delivers in return maybe a hundred, which are similarly all accurately assessed, independently of each other. Amongst these traded items are often claims of a herder on another herder as well as of a herder on a farmer, and ‘vice versa’, and all these purchases and sales result in

a general settlement of accounts. But it was more convenient again not having to worry about this settling of accounts, not having to wonder what would be best to take in exchange for what is being offered, not to look for those who had bad debts or to use them by digging one hole to fill another; not having to do all these operations at the same time, and needing to well advertise them. One can however, also fully obtain this same purpose and without encountering any of these obstacles by the forging of money from precious metals, and by spreading it in sufficient abundance in society, so that everyone could, in a way, split all their exchanges into two parts and so complete one's sale before considering one's new purchase. In this way, for a while at least, the value of the exchanged thing is in ecus in anyone's hands.

One offers one's merchandise, which is estimated at a certain number of ideal pounds, against the same number of pounds in ecus. This is called selling; then one uses these ideal pounds in ecus so as to obtain the goods one needs, which is called buying. In straight barter, it was necessary to determine at the same time the value of two unknowns, the two types of commodity which were offered one against the other; in sales, followed by a new purchase, determining the value of these two unknowns is done by two different operations and happens completely independent of each other.

272

To determine each of these unknowns, it is necessary that a gold or silver currency which is given against it in exchange, is recognized as absolutely invariable in its value; indeed, the real national wealth likely to increase in value is the commodity itself; as it is the object that, bought at a certain price, must be resold at a higher price to give profit, while the money must be returned precisely at the price at which it was received. The piece of cloth that was sold for thirty pieces of silver representing as many aliquot parts of universal wealth can, under better circumstances, sell for thirty-five, forty, or fifty of those same pieces, and of these same aliquots; but the silver coins will be always equal to the same number of aliquots. So in any sale, the one who offers the money gives a certainty, while the one who offers the goods gives an uncertainty. The result is that one often gets rich by keeping merchandise until it increases in price, but one never gets richer by keeping specie, because its price cannot vary and increase.

Whoever therefore thinks of gaining, whoever dreams of amassing capital, is in a hurry to get rid of his money coins, which never lead to a gain, and exchange them for goods which alone presents one the chances of a profit. We are however, beginning to see the emergence alongside the numeraire, in its shadow in a way, a kind of circulating capital, which is just another expression to designate the whole national wealth, this capital which is only the sum of all ideal pounds, of all the values that the numeraire is representing. Such an object, we have said, was worth eight of these ideal pounds, another one – twelve, yet another one – twenty. The ideal pound is for each a determined aliquot of their total value, the eighth, the twelfth, the twentieth; but considered in relation to national wealth, these are units,

of which the sum is unknown. However the sum of all these units is the national fortune. This capital is called circulating, when the sum of these ideal units, which forms the fortune of an industrialist, is invested in turn in things that are always new,

273

and which are exchanged against each other; it is called fixed, when a part of these ideal units takes a form that does not vary, and only serves to increase the value of capital identities that vary by circulating.

No operation of our mind requires more effort, and leads to more fatigue, than that which must be done to understand the nature of capital, a true Proteus, which constantly changes shape and essence, which fades away when you think you got a hold of it, and which, after accumulating heaps of gold, leaves only smoke in the hands of those who pounce on trying to understand it. Capital is much the same as wealth, and yet it is posterior to it in its existence; it is an appreciation of this wealth, born of commerce and realized by it; it is the abstract image of all the values that commerce has at its disposal.

Since capital is a business idea, it is at the commercial level where it needs to be approached; not as a definition, but as practical knowledge. Open the account books of a merchant, look for his balance sheet, examine all his holdings; this asset, he will tell you himself, is his capital. There you will first find that the general-merchandise account owes him a certain amount. This is the value of all the products he buys for resale, and which are the special objects of his trade. He values them in ideal pounds, according to what they have cost him to produce or to procure, and he regards them as his debtors, until the moment when their debts will be discharged by the sale, and when new objects bought back or reproduced at once will then represent his ideal pounds.

One will next find that his mill, or his factory, owes him a certain amount. this is the part of the commercial wealth that he prepared in the form of equipment to help his industry along; it has been called fixed capital, and under this name we understand everything that is not the object of its merchandisings,

274

but which help him to accomplish the latter, from the simplest tool to the most complicated machine, to these immense factories, those expensive drives, and furnaces which impose steam on such prodigious human work. The more often fixed capital consists of a building, it becomes part of the nature of territorial wealth, except that it is consumed slowly by the use it is in fact put to. If a businessman has land, he also counts it among his debtors, for a sum equal to that which he bought it for, or for which he could sell it. This value of buildings, in ideal pounds, is in fact part of his capital, but it does not circulate, and by itself does not give any impulse to his business.

One also will find that the businessman counts in his receivables, its debts, or all that is owed to him by individuals, by companies, by public funds. It's a part of the wealth that we have referred to by the name of intangible capital, and of which economists generally have too little taken into account. We will come back to this in the next Essay, and we will show how all the claims form a right over the property of others, by which it embraces present and future ownership, the revenue that labor has created, and which it is hoped will create again in the future.

And finally the businessman, on his balance sheet, as part of his assets, accounts for the ecus he has in the cash register. This fund owes him a certain portion of that, be it only a minimal portion of his capital, for the ecus which are deposited there.

Circulating capital is thus not the same as a numeraire; on the contrary, it is constantly exchanged against a numeraire, as well as the numeraire activating its circulation. And just as circulating capital isn't identical with the numeraire, it is not commensurate with it either. It's true enough that in an inverse sense the two circulations are balancing each other out at each transaction while going in opposite directions, but not with an equal speed. Capital, or public wealth taken as a whole, earns a revenue; known as 'interest'. The revenue, for circulating capital, results from the increase in the price of goods, while they are made, or made available to consumers; for fixed capital, the increase in value that it gives to these

275

same capital goods; for buildings, fruits of the earth; for receivables, a participation in the revenue of debtors. Only the cash account doesn't do anything; for as long as the money remains in kind in its embrace, it is completely sterile. It follows that all the parts of wealth follow, in their circulation, a different course, and as such are subject to a greater or lesser acceleration. The circulation of goods is slowed down to give them time to produce a profit; that is, by the labor that makes them, or by the one who transports and distributes them. It is not necessary to sell either fixed capital, nor buildings to make a profit; if therefore their charges sometimes take time to circulate, it is according to a particular convenience.

Likewise, debts earn interest without the need to circulate them; but some are at term, and their payment is nothing else than their exchange for the numeraire; the others are undefined, but they can be bought and sold in terms of the numeraire like goods. In exchange for all these diverse natures of wealth, it is always the numeraire that we give or that we are supposed to give (1); but as is, in so much as keeping it, it never brings a profit, the businessman who keeps it in his till is always in a hurry to get rid of it, to hurry it into circulation, to make it change hands, much more often than his circulating capital; much more often than any other kind of wealth.

Thus, there are always two circulations in society that run opposite to each other. The numeraire passes successively into the hands of all those who need it to carry out their exchanges. A buyer gives it to a seller, who in

turn becomes a buyer, and so on, as long as there is an object whose ownership must pass from one hand to another. At the same time,

(1) We say “or that we are supposed to give”, because, as we will see later, instead of the numeraire, we often give claims that we regard as equal to the numeraire, because we can at will, and without profit or loss, exchange them for money.

276

circulating capital is transmitted in ideal pounds, through a series of markets, from producer to consumer. The manufacturer advanced this capital, in commodities, in raw materials, to the worker, who returned it to him with increases in merchandise; he delivered it, with a further increase, to the wholesaler, who distributed it to the retailer, and the latter to the consumer. This last transaction balances all the costs, all the profits that form the revenue of all those who contributed to the circulation of capital in ideal pounds.

The circulation of the numeraire happens all the more rapidly as society gets more civilized, as property gets better guaranteed, and while all are achieving a better business acumen; as everyone is also getting ever more accustomed to finding revenue producing properties of all kinds, and also becomes aware better that as long as the numeraire is kept either in a till or in a wallet, no interest will be earned. In uncivilized countries, on the other hand, everyone feels that cash money is always equal to itself in value; always good to exchange for anything one needs, and is the best protector against unknown dangers. Each one feels by accumulating it, that, keeping it in reserve in one's safe, conveys a power. The more stormy the state of society however, the more everyone is in search of power, in preference to pleasures. The owner feels that in the midst of troubles, it is this power condensed in form of cash that is a defense against it, while saving it for his most pressing need; he also knows that it is a type of wealth that is the easiest to conceal for all prying eyes, exciting the least envy, and which escapes most easily from plunder. Although in countries overwhelmed by anarchy or despotism, the capital circulating in trade often still yields a considerable profit, the largest number of those who have some wealth do not want run the frightening odds of trade under those circumstances, and they rather bury their money than to lend it at interest or change it into circulating capital. Indeed, a loan doubles their chances of experiencing

277

some damage or looting. To all the risks that the creditor runs, he must add those that could ruin the debtor; the rich person must still tell that what he prefers to keep to his own, at least to one person, the borrower, and if he wants to take sureties, he must again tell the witnesses or the notary. In Turkey, in Persia, in India, every man, without exception, hoards all that he can, he locks up, he hides, he buries all the coins he was able to get; and he will never let one out of his hands, without thinking that he is about to lose one of his guarantees. In most civilized countries, on the contrary,

every man has become a kind of merchant in this, in that he does not want his capital to remain dormant in his hands, even for the shortest time. In England, the richest men most foreign to commerce, all have an account opened with their banker; they pay whatever they owe or buy, by drawn assignments on him, and they keep very little money at home.

Consequently, in uncivilized or oppressed countries, there is very little in the way of circulating capital, and comparatively a lot of cash exists, that true enough, remains almost always hidden. In civilized countries, to the contrary, and where property is guaranteed, there is a very considerable circulating capital and proportionately very little cash. Since circulating capital is an abstract quantity and elusive, and as it is always transmitted by means of cash (in which, moreover, it does not differ from any other kind of wealth), and since it is never designated as such by the number of ecus it represents, it is usually confused with cash, even by those who are the most knowledgeable in business. Almost all customary practices in commerce as well as its phraseology increase this confusion, and because of this they are unsuitably defined. Money is scarce, they say, or money is abundant, but these expressions refer to circulating capital, to intangible capital. not to any precious metal coins.

When they say that money is scarce, it's when there is a lot of debt to pay off; and money is plentiful means that there are a lot of people who offer to lend and thus form new debts. In neither one nor the other case, does it matter whether the transaction is carried out with coined ecus or not. The transmission of intangible capital by a transfer of existing accounts, a new

278

assignment, or a bill of exchange, is all equally effective; it does in no way depend on the rarity or the abundance of coined ecus.

This continual confusion of circulating capital with the numeraire however is the cause which engaged both governments and individuals in a series of efforts, often contradictory, to increase what seemed to them to be the universal driving force of any industry, the numeraire they took for capital; they increased, however, not the wealth, but the means of counting it.

Some wanted to create more precious metals; others import them into the country, others alter them by an alloy, and give them the appearance of being more than they were worth; and yet others again, replace them with a less expensive convention of general payment, printed notes, which they then believed could be multiplied at will. This would be somewhat similar to increasing the weight of all to be transported objects if they had tried to replace the weights, used in scales, with lighter ones.

Like any other commodity, precious metals cost to produce; they even cost more or less, depending on the mines being more or less abundant and that their work is more or less easy. But as this work is always very expensive, their value is therefore always very high, in proportion to their weight and their volume; that finally, they are transported all the more easily, all the more surely, as they are almost indestructible, no accident will alter their essence and their value has balanced itself throughout the known universe. This balance, this perfect equality of price from country to country and

from year to year is another of the essential qualities of a measure. It needs to be appreciated at the same time what the commodity is worth and what the money we give against it is worth, or it would no longer be a sale but an exchange; the price would no longer indicate the ideal pound, nor the number of aliquots which stand in relation to universal wealth; and so the merchant would never know whether he had gained or lost. If the weight units intended to measure the weight of some commodity, while carrying it from one country to another,

279

increased or decreased in weight; if the yardsticks intended to measure fabrics lengthened by the heat, or shortened by the cold by a perceivable amount, then weighing and measuring, would be more than useless, they would become a deception. Similarly, if the ratio between what the money is worth in some place and what it costs to produce varied, if the money pound represented sometimes more, sometimes less than the ideal pound, in a way sensitive enough to throw uncertainty into commerce, the very idea of value could no longer be grasped; all those who had believed to start from a certain quantity in the exchanges would be deceived; and all contracts, all transactions, would become distorted.

All these disastrous consequences would result, for commerce throughout the world, from any great variation in the mining of precious metals; that is, insofar it would significantly change the amount extracted at the same time. If this quantity were diminished, each of those who would have made commitments at a later date would be called upon to pay more than he had promised; if this quantity were increased, each of those on the receiving end would receive less; and if finally this quantity was subject to rapid changes, as it is nowadays with the price of almost all commodities produced by industry, the very notion of value would be destroyed, and world commerce would be nothing more than a disastrous game of chance. However, all the encouragement given to the exploitation of precious metal mines cannot have any other the effect than the destruction of this all important proportion. The money exchangers, bankers, have generally given themselves the mission to maintain it. Making money their study, and the object of their business, they watch over the differences in the value of one country to another, which is manifested by the state of exchange, and they hasten to pass the numeraire from a place where it superabundant to where it is lacking; finding, because of the speed of this operation, their benefit in a minimal agio, one, which the flow of commerce can absorb when taken into account. But if the quantities of numeraire at times thrown on the market would become

280

one, which the flow of commerce can absorb when taken into account. But if the quantities of numeraire at times thrown on the market would become much larger, and if at the same time because of this abundance, the price of money got lowered so much that the costs of transport became too high,

this continual work of bankers to maintain the balance of values between various countries would become powerless, and the expression of values in terms of money would cease to be a common language among all peoples.

For any production other than that of precious metals, market demand and production costs compete with more or less equal forces, and so establish the price. But when it comes to the yardstick of all values, market demand exactly conforms to production.

All we ask from money is to form this yardstick in the fixity of its price; also, a denarius is just as proper as an ounce to represent the numerical unit. All money in circulation in the world has a determined value that is totally independent of its quantity. The totality of numeraire multiplied by the number of times each ecu has been paid, over the course of a year, is equal in value to the total mass of things that were sold in the year; likewise multiplied by the number of times each of these of these things passed from hand to hand, and were paid in ecus.

Moreover, this mass of numeraire, whether it weighs a thousand pounds, a million pounds, or a billion pounds, has precisely the same value. So when more of an abundance becomes discovered, or a more advantageous method of extracting the metal is invented, its owner does not get richer, but the value of money is immediately proportioned to the expense of its production; and indeed, of all the mines, those which enrich their owners the least are those of precious metals. However, the discovery of very abundant mines would cause very significant damage to society, by a misleading of all those who contract, on the price at which they buy or sell everything.

The alchemists who pursued the transformation of base

metals would be serving a purpose similar to that of the miners.

Today we no longer dream of accomplishing that great pursuit, although it is very possible that one arrives there without having sought it. There are some indications in science already, seemingly predicting that we are on our way to discovering the secret of nature, in the formation of metals, by using electricity. If we are to succeed in that, the consequences of this discovery will be very unfortunate for the commerce of the world. Gold and silver would become infinitely more abundant, and falling accordingly in price, as to their weight and volume; to represent the same value, it will be much more inconvenient to transport. We will find ourselves in any one country, with regard to currencies, as the situation is today in Russia or in Sweden; where the regulating metal is copper, and where it is impossible for a man to carry the value of one hundred francs with him in numeraire. But the inconvenience of the weight, in domestic transactions, would still be only a small inconvenience, if it did not simultaneously involve the impossibility of rendering the value of precious metals uniform throughout the known universe. Today the wearing of precious metals as an object is of so little importance that their value always remains balanced among all

trading countries, because they immediately move to where they are worth more than their price. But one wouldn't carry hundredweights of gold, as one carries pounds; so that if the standard of values indeed were to rapidly increase by the progress of science, it would altogether lose the advantage of always remaining the same and being valued as such everywhere the same too; to give one an accurate idea of values in different times, and no less precise in different places.

But after having tried to multiply the precious metals without measure, we came across another expedient, that would make all of this unnecessary, or to replace them with paper. Gold and silver specie accomplish, as being the numeraire, two functions at the same time. They serve as a standard, or as a measure of the numerical unit of values, and they are also used to pass these values from one hand to another. There are many ways to replace them to accomplish this

282

last function, but there is none that performs the first. No other production of human industry even approaches the advantages that precious metals have; keeping an identical value, and to serve as a full pledge to those who own them, which they will always find in them, and proportionally in each of their parts, this same value at which they received them.

In enumeration it is essential that two halves, that four quarters, are equal to the whole; but that we count objects in nature which can divide in this way or reunite without their value being altered, whether we count those which can be preserved in the air, in the earth, under water, through a fire, and always reappear identical; those which can be transported easily, hide, so as to to be removed from violence and tyranny, and to find oneself then, after twenty years, after a hundred years, still retaining the same command over everything to their owners. We will soon feel that, if we were obliged to renounce precious metals, if we could no longer make money a real pledge, as well as a sign of values, we would find nothing to substitute for them.

But as for the exchange of values that men carry out between them, it can operate just as well, and much more economically, in a hundred other ways. It can operate by barter, which can be considered as two sales and two purchases, combined in one act. It can be operated by a common book of accounts, where the various traders each have an open account, and where transfers of property from one to the other are accomplished by two lines of writing, like sales are transmitted on the ledger of public debts; it can finally be operated by bills of exchange, by assignments, bearer bonds and banknotes, all of which are only modifications of the original idea of the bill of exchange. A, from Paris, has a claim of 1,000 ecus on B, in London; he fires off a letter of exchange for this sum, and sends it to C, in Amsterdam, to which he owed the same amount or more; this one in turn sends it to D, in Hamburg, to which he also owed an amount, who again sends it to E, in Frankfurt; and a bill of exchange can continue to circulate in this way, accomplishing payments of as many debts, between the hands

of twelve or fifteen endorsers, without there being an ecu disbursed, until it has returned to the hands of its creator, without any cash payment being made in this circulation at all. It is true that when the bill of exchange is ceded in the same city, by a merchant to another merchant, it is generally bought and paid for in money. It's only from one city to another that values are usually transmitted without the intermediary of the numeraire. On the other hand, an assignment is a bill of exchange drawn from one trading house to another in the same town; and it often circulates from hand to hand, it pays or can pay a large number of debts with a single payment. The bearer note is to the assignment, in the same city, what the promissory note is to the bill of exchange from one city to another; it is a promise to pay, instead of a summons to pay, and is also transferable, also a passing of payments from hand to hand, without the paying of any money. For these operations to be carried out in the same city, where it is assumed that the bearers know each other, we have dispensed with the formality of the endorsement, which is an assignment written on the transmitted item's body. Finally, the banknote had its start as a bearer voucher issued by a public institution, that puts a large number of them in circulation at the same time.

The bank promises to pay in specie, upon presentation of any bank note value it has issued; each holder can therefore immediately change it into precious metal coins. But it is precisely because he can do it at any time that he does not do so. Until he needs to have the coins at his disposal, he keeps his banknote, which he finds less heavy, less apparent, less likely to be stolen than the coins. If, on the contrary, he has a payment to make, he delivers his banknote instead of coined ecus, leaving it up to the receiver of the note to collect the coins from the bank. But this one has precisely the same motives as the first bearer, so he does

not remove it from circulation either. And as long as security is complete, the note may well be used in hundreds of successive payments, instead of using the coined numeraire. If this proportion were invariable, and if this security always remained the same, it would suffice to keep a precious metal ecu to represent a circulation of 100 or 200 ecus in banknotes. All the others not any longer being required to perform the cash function, which would from then on be accomplished only by paper. The coins could be thus reduced to ingots and sold as commodities. The banker, counting on the public confidence and nonchalance, would attract in his coffers, in exchange for his paper, almost all the cash coins that belong to the community, and in this way he could make it his profit.

So far this operation presents a limited profit for the banker, and a simple convenience to the public. The banker giving his promises to pay for payments, perceives the same interest on them as if he had indeed paid. His profit is precisely equal to the interest of its circulation in paper, less the interest on the money he keeps in cash coins to deal with remittances.

The public only gains from this substitution to avoid the trouble of having to carry heavy coins from one place to another and to always count them. As society's interest consists of the meeting of individual interests, the bankers' profit on the interest of his distributed banknotes, is, insofar as he makes use of it [by his consumption], part of the social benefit. But this motive would not have been enough to induce the public to encourage the banks; since each of those who resort to it is not long in feeling that he loses in security much more than he gains in convenience, when, instead of a pledge of value, all he now holds is a generally accepted convention as a means of payment. Also the little convenience he gets from being able to carry all his money in a wallet, instead of locking it up in a strongbox, would not have prevailed for long on the fear of a commercial crisis. However, another kind of a more universal convenience was the result of the institution of banks, and it was of special interest to all commerce, but especially to the most active and adventurous among traders, as a support to them. The banks presented

285

themselves as universal loan establishments; they turned to commerce and said: whenever you have any needs, please turn to us, and if you offer us good collateral security, we will always bring you the money you will need at any time.

Every businessman, even the more opulent, may experience a momentary discomfort due to a lack of numeraire. And it is easy to know where to resort to, without ever needing to feel embarrassed; and he is most often very comfortable to be able to increase his operations, using the capital that is offered all the more liberally to him the richer he is considered to be. At the same time the more adventurous, the less rich, usually have a need for funds, and they greedily grab the opportunity to extend their credit as far as it can go; finally, all are flattered by this creation of capital which seems to accommodate them it at their doorstep, and a lending bank that offers its credit to everyone can in general be assured as favorable.

There is this relation between the banking profession and that of the manufacturing industry, that, in one as in the other, the end seems contrary to the means. The goal of the public, by promoting the establishment of factories, is to procure work for the poor, and the means employed by the manufacturer, is to do the same job with fewer hands than before; the proposed goal of the public by promoting the establishment of banks is to pour money into circulation, and the means employed by the bank is to either export the money out of the country or to melt it down. The result of both are the same too, and as one should expect from this contradiction: they both flatter some time by the appearance of prosperity, that however always disappoints in the end; and then, when the moment of an inevitable crisis arrives, convulsions increase disproportionately.

The bank intends to replace cash coins with its banknotes, to accomplish with paper the same circulation that previously was accomplished with coined ecus. It therefore withdraws, by means of its notes, or more often it causes others to withdraw the precious metals from circulation;

either melting them down or exporting them. At the same time it obtains the disposition

286

of that part of the public fortune that was invested in the numeraire, and with which it pushes society into a saving mode. This part, as enumerated in ideal pounds, it lends to those who want to borrow. There is no wealth creation here, there was only a change of destination by means of credit. A determined amount of public wealth was unsuccessful in its realization, by still remaining locked up as numeraire. It was this cash account that owed a precise number of millions to society; it is this specific number that can only be used by institutional lending.

However, it should first be noted that this available number of millions to the bank is not the total sum of the national currency. We said a banknote can pass through hundreds of hands before being converted into precious metal coins. But bankers cannot count on a loan, that the whim of any individual can cut short; they must expect that their banknote at some time will be converted into money coins. First, all the times the holder needs to divide it into smaller parts, when having to pay less; then all the times he feels some fear about the stability of the banking establishment. The first circumscribes the circulation of banknotes in the most peaceful times; the second, when those cease in times of crisis. Then there is in the upper trade, a number of bags of money that never untie. These are the ones that in peaceful times, in denominations of 500 fr. or 1,000 fr. can replace banknotes without any appreciable inconvenience.

They go from one rich merchant's cash register to another rich merchant, in payment of large transactions in which a sum of 1,000 fr. can be viewed as unity. But such same bags of a thousand francs which passes from the banker to the rentier, to the manufacturer, the farmer, to entrepreneurs of all kinds of work, must immediately loosen, and distribute their content by gold coins, by ecus, by sub francs, to as many different payers, to pay, in all the shops, for all the pleasures, the foodstuffs, the subsistence, which are never bought in large sums. Any note of 1,000 fr. which will be paid by the banker to someone who does not do large-scale business, but who wants to spend, who wants to enjoy, who wants to live, will immediately be carried over to the bank to be converted into cash coins.

287

One may well try to convert it into smaller banknotes; but these notes don't go down well towards the consumer, towards the poor, and as soon as they reach them, even if they are only 5 fr., they must be converted into coins.

Thus a wise bank must propose to know with precision the quantity of money that is used in the transactions of the high-trade; the quantity which the large trading houses usually keep at hand, as well as the value of the circulation of which the bags of a thousand francs are the units. These

bags are the only ones that advantageously can be replaced with its issued banknotes. If instead it tries to get its notes into circulations where sums are constantly dividing and recomposing themselves, they will infallibly be pushed back. One hears talk of land, mortgage, and industrial banks; and their mentioned names alone indicates an ignorance of the principles of banking. The owner, the farmer, the manufacturer, who receives say a thousand-franc note, must immediately divide that among a hundred, perhaps among as much as a thousand stakeholders, to pay wages with; who, most often, do not even spend a franc per day, and the employee must in turn change his franc into centimes to meet his various needs. All the banknotes from these banks, either must return immediately to them to be converted into coins, or must pass into the hands of the upper trade, which would receive them as it would those of a distress sale.

Any issue of the type of banknotes which cannot remain in circulation, or which are supernumerary to the quantity of money bags that one never unties, flows back towards the bank, and can cause an artificial crisis. On the other hand, any agitation, any concern about business either public or commercial, any unexpected need for money, also urge all the holders of banknotes to realize them in specie.

The crisis then is not the effect of any particular bank's misconduct, but from the very dangers of the banking institution itself, of the commitment that it took on to pay on presentation, a money it did in no way possess,

288

but which it did not have to keep. In these sudden and general demands, any reluctance to pay, any delay, would increase terror, and would indeed immediately present to the bank all the notes it had put into circulation. Like the slightest mishap, the most unlikely rumor, can suddenly arouse one of these panic reactions, any cautionary bank must always be able to resist a first alarm, before things run out of hand; it must keep in reserve, in its vaults, from a third to a fifth of the precious metal underlying the paper that it has in circulation; even though the lost interest on all that specie it reserves represents a loss in its profits.

While at the time of a crisis the bank continuously pays out in specie whatever it holds, it does so by immense sacrifices, by borrowing, buying, and importing it from abroad. The truth of the matter is, that it promised something that it knew could never be fulfilled, in the hope that no one would ever ask it to fulfill that promise. It promised to keep any loan at the disposal of its creditors, all the specie its banknotes represented, and if it had done so, instead of accumulating bank profits, there wouldn't have been this certain loss. At the time of a crisis, hardly anyone is content with banknotes as a way to pay one's accounts. Coined ecus, at those times, become just as convenient; and he wants to keep a sure pledge of the values he gave up in his hands. If he had any merchandise in store, he would feel the richness he has in them; and, while true enough, more or less difficult to realize now, it still would not escape him entirely. The banknote, on the contrary, is only a sheet of paper; which may well be worthless at the times he most needs it. The creditworthiness of the bank,

the land that underlies its a guarantee, are not sufficient to support its credit, because in times of a crisis, or even at any moment that money is needed, that the bad luck of having to wait for it, even just for a fortnight, can cost one a fortune if not one's life. Besides, if the general loss of credit lasts for some time, there is no bank that is immune from failure, and this regardless of taking the desperate step of withdrawing

289

all its paper, and to close up shop altogether. Indeed, all the various operations that it can do to obtain the means to survive, are always reduced to buying money, against its paper which is distributed at a loss; and then at par return this money against its own paper. If this operation is repeated frequently, as it is in a time of crisis, then there is no capital left, at least not in any considerable amount, that it does not have to destroy. In general, banks restore their credit by the speed of their payments; and when they have to hold out for a couple or three days, against the crowd that besieged them, to repay their notes, they were counting on that crowd to disperse; but two or three more days of the same disadvantageous position would necessarily lead them into bankruptcy.

We assumed the crisis to be completely independent of the bank, which is feeling the consequences of its actions. We were supposing that it was the result of an invasion, of an insurrection, of a revolution, or only of some great upheaval in commerce, of some considerable bankruptcies, of some congestion of the market, which prevents a large number of businessmen, to at some time disburse their normal advances. But whatever the cause of discomfort or the public terror may have been, bank convulsions make it singularly worse. If the money circulation were only in specie, the natural effect of this terror would be a simple suspension of business; but clients would not show up at their merchants. The latter would perhaps still lock up or hide his goods, and whoever still had money would not want to part with it. The only universally proven loss would be that of the embedded product of labor during those alarming days, but, to a certain extent, it would be compensated for by a decrease in consumption. But an existence of banks, on the contrary, alarms everyone at the moment of disorderly activity. Each banknote holder runs to the bank, at the same time, so as to get paid; each banker negotiates with all holders of specie ecus to redeem them; the same thought occupies

290

all heads, stirs up all imaginations, gatherings follow gatherings. Reason matters for ever less; and deliberations take on an ever more dangerous character, in turn becoming the cause of the evil which had caused them to become excited in the first place. The need for capital however, was one of the main causes of the crisis, and this singular need only increased further by a sudden disappearance of enormous amounts of capital. All the paper that was performing the function of cash disappears from circulation at the

same time, to go en masse back to the bank of issue; all the underlying specie is sucked out of the bank, which tries to buy it back at any cost. Panic, followed by terror, makes society instantly convert from a civilized state to a wild state, where everyone hoards, where everyone wants to have power condensed in their strong boxes. Finally, the total bank-held capital is paralyzed and cut off from all social capital, precisely because this social capital was proven insufficient for its current needs.

At the price of the present actions of the Banque de France, its capital is now equivalent to one hundred and sixty-two million. Let us judge by how much any political or commercial crisis would be increased, if the very effect of this crisis were to cut off, at least momentarily, those same one hundred and sixty-two million in circulation.

Whatever the wisdom of a bank and its solidity means, it is an institution that cannot be introduced into a country where mistrust reigns. Because, while it is true enough that it is in its nature to facilitate the movement of commerce in calm times, it also needs to support commerce through all storms, to offer its resources to prosperity, and to withdraw them violently at the same time when adversity arrives. But these real dangers of banking systems are infinitely increased by common misconceptions about them, not the least among the very same people who are involved in conducting that business, and by the efforts that several of them accredit these errors to, in order to serve their own greed. So we hear about every day of the creative power of credit, of the importance to capitalize on the national fortune, the assistance banks

291

could engage in to provide industry, agriculture, property owners, already overwhelmed with debts, in commerce when discomfort is experienced. The fact however is that credit does not create anything, it only borrows and displaces already existing capital. Industry needs the power to control and maintain work. This power is transmitted with the numeraire, but the latter does not create anything. Saturated by this illusion on the effect of their power, few banks have the wisdom to limit their operations to their true purpose of utility creation. They believe they are creating capital by throwing a superabundant mass of paper into circulation, which the latter repels, and which immediately returns to the banker to be exchanged for specie.

This return of the paper notes back to the bank of issue is enough to spread the alarm; even that part of the paper which could have been quite usefully employed, is now equally rejected from circulation. And while the banker goes bankrupt, he ruins all those who had given him their guarantee; all those who were holding some of his banknotes suddenly find themselves deprived of their means to do business; and above all, society as a whole experiences a disturbance, a fright, an interruption in all transactions that are mercantile in nature, may result in the ruin of many fortunes, as well as the most dangerous of political upheavals.

The creation of banks increases, as long as the calm lasts, a mass of capital circulating in the country, to animate industry, and is worth a considerable

sum; it displays a third, maybe a half of the precious metals that were used before as numeraire, and which does cost society, by bringing it nothing; against an equal value of ideal pounds, which doesn't cost the new banker anything. This is the greatest benefit to society that a banker could claim. But are we at a time when increasing intangible capital is a desirable advantage? Doesn't society have, not only enough, but infinitely too much already? Undoubtedly, the project-makers, entrepreneurs without funds, commercial adventurers will answer no; they will find that there is not enough capital, because they don't have any themselves; that money is scarce, as the saying goes, because they cannot get hold of it themselves. Perhaps however, the most fortunate thing for society would be if they won't be able to find it either. We have discovered that the cause of the greatest suffering of our time, is

292

the deplorable or exaggerated excitement that the English call 'over-trading'; in manufacturing it is the eagerness to prepare more goods than can be consumed; and for the merchant, to import more than can be sold. The purpose of it all is a dogged pursuit of aleatory profits rather than mercantile profits. It was to base one's hope, not on some service that is rendered to one's customers, but on the ruin of other merchants. This plenitude, this congestion of trade, is the work of adventurous merchants, of those who want to enter where there is no place for them; of those who want to activate work, where no work is required. Legitimate trade, trade that is bound to be prosperous, prepares things as the need to consume them arises; but the aleatory trade, the trade which tends to congestion, often prepares to employ capital which had remained idle. In fact, many causes can determine that undertaking a work, against expectation, is yet destined to be venal: the inventions of ingenious men, a demand for labor of the poor, the demand for the use of capital, and finally the demand for the thing itself by the consumer; but the first three most often disappoint, while the latter alone ensures enduring success for the entrepreneur. Modern societies have accumulated a prodigious mass of capital, they are embarrassed by it, they are overwhelmed, and it is this overabundance that constantly pushes them towards aleatory trade. Since the universal war ended, this prodigious consuming of capital is over, we saw the richest nations with a kind of fury throw millions upon millions into it, first in loans to America and to most continental nations, then in the mining companies of the former Spanish colonies, and later again into the many hundreds of so-called industrial companies, which have been formed in England simultaneously, and that we have compared to soap bubbles, seeing them all bursting and fainting out at the same time;

293

hence the name that we gave them (the bubbles); and finally in railway companies. The capital of these various speculations surpasses perhaps more than a hundred times, that which the banks can put at the service of

the public. A large part of this capital has been dissipated, annihilated; the successive bankruptcies of governments, mines, shareholder companies, caused the ruin of many thousands of families, and spread desolation everywhere; but it is not easy to calculate what would have happened without the creation and later bankruptcies of these facilities, nor if such immense capital hadn't been destroyed, and so the bloated state of society had always kept on increasing.

Fifty years ago, most of the trading houses worked half with their own funds, and half with those that they had borrowed for the long term, or what was called on deposit. They undertook, under private endorsement, to be returned in four or six years, the sum which was loaned to them, and to pay until that time the interest at about four or five percent. This way of borrowing has been completely abandoned since. It has been replaced by current accounts and discounts. By current accounts, capitalists entrust merchants with their capital funds for an indefinite term, reserving the right to withdraw them in part at any time they want, and perceiving the interest of the number of days which the merchant enjoyed on each part. By the discount, the capitalist gives money against bills of exchange on long terms, deducting the interest from the time they will be running. But in countries where banks are established, merchants nowadays are refusing these kind of transactions every day, they don't want to pay more interest on their current accounts, and they prefer to go to the bank to discount their bills of exchange. It is because the money of the capitalists is thus pushed away more and more from commerce, that we have recently seen them rush so recklessly into such a large number of dangerous enterprises. The evil that the capitalists experience is a social evil, the

294

convenience that entrepreneurs find in reaching out to banking is perhaps a social evil too. If society suffers from reckless companies, companies established in rivalry to one another so as to under-sell each other, it must be wishing that a borrower does not find it too easy to obtain capital, but that he feels a little under the control of a lender, and whether he needs to persuade him of his caution before getting his money. But where there are banks, especially where banking is free and in rivalry with itself, it will be lenders seeking out borrowers, trying to seduce them by facilities that can be offered; it is the lender who is especially eager to lend, because a bank is ruined if it does not place its paper. The latest crisis in America, which has been shaking up the trade world-wide, has also made it known with how much insistence the English bankers urged the Americans on to take advantage of their credit; as their traveling salesmen were going to offer them their commodities (and these were commodities running well in the thousands and ten thousand pounds sterling); with a recklessness they had been entrusting adventurous merchants with a fortune ten times greater than than what these local merchants could answer for.

This is the whole story of the crisis: with a credit that they did not deserve, the American merchants gave orders disproportionate to their chances of sale, the factories redoubled their activity to carry out these orders, and so

appeared to be in a high state of prosperity; the goods finally arrived on the market and in a quantity far greater than America could ever consume; and while these have arrived, the consumers did not. The moment to pay up came before the goods were half sold, the merchants demanded new credit, that was denied to them; and the bankers abandoned themselves to a terror proportionate to the recklessness of their earlier confidence. Bankruptcies have followed one another with frightening rapidity, while unsold goods have fallen in price far below the costs of production, with a still more frightening, more despairing speed especially for the English workers.

The proliferation of banks is therefore the main cause of what the English call 'over-trading'; of this sickly state of industry, which, like fever, gives all the appearance of vigor and activity, while it bears within itself a fire

295

which consumes it. And yet we are sure, in seeking to restrain them, to stir up a universal clamor; in having bankers, all their shareholders, and all those who are thinking of becoming one, against you; to have against you all those who borrow from a bank, who make it discount all their bills of exchange, or those who think that they will need to have it discounted for them at some day; and finally, to have against oneself all the interests of adventurers, because these are the ones who are always the most eager for new things and who always express themselves the loudest.

The solid trader would find borrowing from capitalists, at specified terms, as good as at the bank; a stockbroker would have them discount his paper in silver, just as easily as having it discounted in banknotes. In Geneva, where this discount is made in silver, it rarely amounts to 4 percent. But the capitalist only advances his money with thought, with caution, and after having reviewed the creditworthiness of the undersigners.

This review, which repels the adventurer, is disagreeable even to one who has nothing to fear; however it is the real guarantee of public wealth, for the safety of capital, and even much more for the safety of the industry, against any rough-and-tumble activity.

Such are the advantages, and such are the dangers of banks. Is it wise, for such slight benefits, to let it run such serious dangers to society? Is there any proportion between the small convenience offered to all, in times of peace, and the turmoil of all fortunes, the upheaval which threatens public order itself in these severe crises to which England and the United States are periodically exposed, and that we only know as a backlash in countries where there is no direct bank involvement? We do not hesitate to say that, where no bank exists yet, it is an act of wisdom on the part of government not to let any be established; it is an act of wisdom not to allow the

296

formation of a shareholder company to establish one, not allowing either individuals or associations to issue bearer notes, nor promises to pay that are transferable without the formality of an endorsement.

In general, political economy stops at a search of principles, and leaves their application to the science of legislation; the latter, in order to do so, must study the facts and circumstances. Therefore we will not express here any opinion on already established banks. We believe, however, in addressing the issue of monopoly in their regard. Several publicists in England, drawing on the example of America, have called for the banking business to be free for everyone, as it represented the exclusive privilege reserved for a few companies as an injustice. They forget that the banker, who issues trust notes, does not speculate on what is his, but on what is public property; and which he has no right to clandestinely attribute to himself for his own use. The credit that a banker asks from the one to whom he hands out a banknote, is so short, that the one with whom he deals barely gives him the time to consider whether he is worthy of it. Moreover, most often, it is the banker who asks for credit, instead of granting it; because the transaction has this peculiarity, that each one presents himself as a debtor, and each thinks above all of getting his paper, one his bill of exchange, the other his banknote, vouched for by the other. The banknote taker, instead of being difficult on its acceptance, finds his account being better off to get rid of it as soon as it has received it. In such a transaction, the government, protector of public property, and called in particular to guarantee the benefit of the numeraire which is a part of this property, would do well to watch and if necessary to intervene on behalf of a public, which does not have the means to watch itself. This is how it ensures the maintenance of public roads; for, although each of those who pass through on it is interested in it not being obstructed, no passenger will obstinately fight against one who usurps a part of it.

A numeraire is a public highway of sorts too, and whoever, using paper circulation, borrowing it for export, undermines this public road in which it may well be damaged. If private interests were watching to restrict the traffic in banknotes, the government could leave it up to them.

297

Thus there would be no need to attend to the circulation of bills of exchange, for whoever accepts or who endorses a bill of exchange with their eyes still open to the consequences, government knows that that person becomes fully responsible for it until his full repayment, that can always be traced back to him; just like him being able to go back to the first one who accepted it, and confront him about a credit that was too easily granted. If whoever receives and gives a bank note was obliged to endorse it, there would no longer be any reason to fear that any bank would usurp the public numeraire, without giving sufficient guarantees. But when the note is on the bearer, whoever receives has such a fleeting interest, so as devoid of any responsibility to refuse abusive credit; which the public, for whom this interest is of the utmost importance, cannot delegate to it all his vigilance. And so he must be on guard not by himself but by his government, as the formation of his usual representatives. It is on this required vigilance that the convenience of the banking monopoly and justice rests.

By granting a charter, without which no bank must be allowed to exercise its functions, a government can in several ways still restrict an exaggerated activity. It must first of all prevent any rivalry, any competition between the banks; it must prevent the bankers, in order to take away business from each other, seeking borrowers; while it's still up to them to seek lenders, and show them that they deserve their trust. The rivalry between bankers in England and America, makes them deploy an activity which is the very opposite of their wealth and means; hellbent to remove their adversaries from practicing, they saturate all channels of commerce with their paper. The government still has to refuse a money-issuing charter to mortgage banks and territorial banks, since the very name these take indicates that their founders have no idea of the business that they want to undertake. With their paper they are claiming to advance to borrowers, not

298

circulating capital, but that part of capital which will no longer circulate, but which will change into fixed capital. The man who borrows banknotes to assert the worth his land; once having spent them is no longer destined to see them again in his life. Maybe these banknotes will be received as a result of some other commercial circulation; but it's more likely that they immediately will be returned to the banker to be exchanged for specie. The government can and must still demand that banknotes are only put into circulation when these represent considerable sums. Banknotes of the Banque de France, of which the smallest are 500 francs, and the largest 1,000 francs, are hardly used except for discounting bills of exchange or for treasury payments. Notes of 100 francs would descend into small-scale commerce; notes of 25 francs would pass into the portfolios of all private individuals, and would make gold disappear absolutely from commerce. Notes of 5 franc would reach the farmer and laborer, and would also make silver disappear, as it has disappeared already from England, Austria, Russia, and even from the Papal States; as when a system of paper money found its existence in all these nations. With such limitations, one can reap the benefits of banks without feeling the most serious drawbacks. In fact, we have seen the Banque de France go through the ages more critically, without giving in to the excesses by which banking establishments have shaken commerce elsewhere. We can still, better than has been done in France, limit them further so that they do not lead to hazardous enterprises and aleatory speculation. But the slope is slippery; we will still be besieged as we were and as we are today, by those who demand that banks offer more assistance to commerce and more impetus to industry, for as long as no invincible counterargument to such vacuous claims has been presented;

299

one that appraises with justice the scourge of market congestion, and when the limitation of the banking system has been shown to justify a powerful obstacle to the over-exuberance of manufacturing output.

SEVENTEENTH ESSAY

Intangible Capital, or Receivables.

By continuing our research on commercial wealth, we see claims recurring on all sides, as if they were an important part of it. From the perspective of commerce, the entire national fortune is itself a claim. In it being the exchangeable value of everything, considered abstractly; which forms the capital of each particular person, is also the capital of the nation. Commerce, which taught one to supplant useful value with exchangeable value, also taught to consider sometimes things, sometimes men, as being the debtors of this exchangeable value; it thus somehow separated the shadow from the body, and it introduced the possibility of possessing them separately. The entire bulk of society's circulating capital is contained within its simultaneously existing commodities. These goods, in the language of accountancy, owe their value to the one who owns them, and he himself may owe this value to yet another party. In this same language, land, buildings, fixed capital, owe their value to the owner, but they can also owe it in whole or in part, by mortgages, to a third party. The numeraire itself owes its value to the one who holds it in his cash register, but this value can also be separated from its underlying substance, by banknotes.

All these riches come into being through human labor; and these riches, in turn supporting this work, give rise to the revenue of society, or the constant appearance of these riches; which can be consumed without the

impoverishment of society. This appearance, involving all those works considered by commerce, must be in exchangeable values, and not in quantities. Society prospers when this appearance is considerable, it suffers when it decreases, not in quantity, but in value; for it would still suffer if the quantity would increase, but the value decreased.

As property ownership contributes entirely to this value increase, which results more immediately from human labor, a universal relationship establishes itself by competition between all property and revenue, between all capital and interest. Interest is that part of revenue, in exchangeable value, in ideal pounds, which is reborn every year from the exchangeable value, also in ideal pounds, from the wealth of society or of its capital. The usual relationship between capital and interest, is that wherever we see capital, we expect interest; that wherever there is an interest, we presupposed the existence of a capital, and we often thus create an imaginary capital that went into commerce, just as well as real capital.

We do not know if this first exposure to such an abstract subject is already sufficiently clear; but even were it immediately understood, we feel the

need to develop it by examples, because the obscurity and the lack of a determinateness of language have constantly confused circulating capital with the numeraire. Also, even during those times that the distinction has been momentarily grasped, habit and a certain laziness of mind, still make one run the risk of falling back into the same confusion. The value of all existing market goods in society is considered to constitute its circulating capital; and the circulation attributed to it is the continual change of forms of things which contain this value, or the different manifestations through which the spending of the businessman's capital goes, while a commodity arises or the following up to that by bringing it to its destination.

302

It is remarkable that, in this circulation, a merchant's capital appears at least as often as a claim as under some material form.

When it is announced that the entrepreneur of a new factory intends to spend 100,000 francs, to set an industry into motion, this sum expresses its circulating capital, or the exchangeable value in ideal pounds, of all the wealth he intends to exchange annually in his business. The mind deceived by language however, immediately imagines a sum of ecus equal to the capital he wants to employ. This sum hardly ever exists. Any industry that is requiring successive disbursements, which must be repeated more or less equally throughout the year; the one who, to undertake it, would bring the 100,000 fr. in ecus, would lose the interest of the greater part of his capital. Rather, it suits him better to divide it into fifty equal parts, and to receive only 2,000 fr. per week. If when he started his business he sold land, he borrowed or whatever, and he finally got the 100,000 fr. together at the same time, his first operation must be to exchange them for debts, to procure, if he can, 2,000 fr. cash, and forty-nine notes of 2,000 fr. payable week to week. If he succeeds in making such an exact division of his assets, all its circulation in cash will never be more than 2,000 francs, he will never handle more than 2,000 francs of cash of the company, in spite of his circulating capital amounting to 100,000 francs.

More likely the funds of the new factory already existed for him, in the form of debts: it was a portfolio filled with bills of exchange on trade. These would be certain and near term receivables, or perhaps it was a current account with a banker, claims on trade, realizable by a creditor when required; they could be mortgages, claims on real estate, which are achievable only at a fixed and distant term; or perhaps stocks on the canals, on mines, on banks, debts

303

on companies that do mercantile business themselves, unable to pay them off now but which a carrier may assign or sell to another holder; finally, it could be interest bearing public bonds, claims on a government of an arbitrary country, which in general are no more feasible to redeem than private company shares, but that a creditor may assign to another creditor to thus withdraw his capital.

Sometimes, it's true also that the entrepreneur of a manufacture, of a trade, of any industry, makes his investments in goods: he provides wool, hemp, or cotton, for weaving, or he undertakes to feed his workers with the products of a farm he owns; but those who know the business know that this advance in naturals is almost always very limited; that the big advance is in receivables, and that it is always these which are misunderstood when there is talk about advances.

Thus, in trading enterprises, debts form the most considerable part of the capital engaged therein. They recur each year in the trader's portfolio, to regularly distribute his revenue throughout the year. Often, moreover, a manufacturer works on his credit; he owes the circulating capital that he employs in his company to someone else; or he doesn't pay his building contractors, his material suppliers upon delivery, but only by three-month or six-month term notes every month. On the other hand, he could also be selling futures himself, and it will be on him that a claim is exercised; as he received payments on his merchandise bills of exchange or promissory notes from his clients.

But receivables are an even greater part of the fortunes of those who are not commercially involved. Let everyone do their own account, and they will be amazed to discover how small a part the numeraire plays in the make up of their fortune, and how much debts make up a considerable part of it.

The first item in a rich man's inventory will likely be the land he owns; then all the buildings on it, that more or less share the same value. For industry it will be: land, mines, houses, factories, and all fixed capital. The need to compare dissimilar things has made one become accustomed to estimating buildings at the price that these could be obtained for in terms

304

of the numeraire, while at the same time considering them to be an equal amount of capital. Buildings however are not subject to commercial traffic in commodities; the way to take advantage of them is to keep them, not to sell them. Their real value is the revenue commonly attributed to them; it is only by exception that they are sold. If we offered them all for sale at the same time, their market value would drop disproportionately, without the owners, or without the nation having become impoverished in reality. Their real value is only affected by events which make their use more or less advantageous. On the other hand, when the revenue from the interest on circulating capital falls, when it no longer gives the same profit to industry, the price of buildings rises in a common appreciation; without the landowners actually having become richer. Instead of valuating them at twenty times their annual revenue, or at five percent, they are valued at twenty-five times, thirty times, forty times the same revenue; or their rent becomes now calculated at two and a half percent, but without any of the enjoyments of these so-called enriched being increased, without even the possibility of getting rid of their buildings at this higher price, if several of them were trying to do so at the same time.

After buildings, the most important item in any rich man's inventory will almost always be debts; sometimes one understands them under the name of liquid fortune. More often though, capitalist millionaires are referred to as rich in cash. In England, where we should focus our attention on, capitalists whose fortune is in receivables, are designated under the name of 'moneyed interest'; this in itself indicates that, as these are ecus that are owed to them, it is those ecus that form their property. If one would count all the currency, all the ecus that they really possess however, one would see that these amount to very little; and that if only one of them wanted to realize all his debts at once, all the others would find there to be no more cash around. The more closely these capitalists are committed to trade, the more they are in touch

305

with their business, the more empty their cash register will be, while their portfolios are full. The very cash they would need for the circulation of their capital, is left with their bankers; which is therefore no more than a debt; most of them leave whatever they need for their daily expenses with the same banker, and they settle all their accounts with assignments. Many wealthy capitalists, far from keeping half or a quarter of their fortune at home in the form of money, not even close to ten percent of their revenue is tied up in that. In such a person's inventory one finds furniture, libraries, art collections, the equipment of staff, all the chattels that he has collected to provide for his enjoyment. These furnishings can be rich, sumptuous even, and can give a pretty close idea of the opulence of their owner; they do not however, at least in his own estimation, form a part of his fortune proper. When he accounts for that by thousands of ecus, he counts the former for nothing, because of the fact that he cannot expect any revenue from it; and it's the revenue alone, that gives him the feeling of ease and perpetuity. Likewise, all the non-revenue producing part of his wealth most often isn't subject to taxes either, nor should it ever be. Taxes should indeed only be for the public servants' participation in the revenue of other individuals; and all these furnishings are just a part of revenues that were already taxed when having been transformed to be enjoyed, and which is currently undergoing its consumption.

Among the rich, those who are engaged in merchandising, will enter the inventory of the goods they have in store, into the account of their fortune; and indeed, for a few, this is the most significant part. Merchants perform a dual function in relation to consumers. They keep in store for themselves everything that they may possibly need in a given duration of time. They seek at the same time to match, to offer consumers the choice between a variety of goods, to be sure to meet their

306

tastes or fancies. To succeed in one or the other function, it is necessary for them to keep their stores full, and this is how they engage in delaying the circulation of capital; leaving the goods stationary in some way, while

the numeraire is still circulating. But, on the other hand, this delay easily becomes a cause of loss for them.

Interest charges run incessantly against the total value of all goods; and if, in the case of a single merchant, he fails to match them, he loses business, and, for wanting to be too rich, he loses revenue. From this follows a constant effort, by any one merchant, to ensure that his stores are well stocked, with the least possible advances. He renews as often as he can, but at least once a year, his assortments; having successive shipments made by the factories that supply him. And if these were suspended, say for six months, 'the article', as he calls it, would be absolutely missed by him. He does his best to offer variety to buyers, but it is rather in terms of samples than of the goods themselves; and among those that are asked of him, he has usually just run out and needs a week or ten days to restock. This is an important observation, however, and one that does not seem to have been made before us: that this general fund of society, this fund of wealth in commodity inventories, decreases instead of increasing, as the nation becomes more active and more industrious. All merchants bear the loss they would have to make on a capital which would be held dormant; each, despite the desire to dazzle buyers with an abundant display, more closely watches the advances he can make, strives to renew them more often, and shows more eagerness to get rid of everything before it ages in his stores. Besides, all our means of transportation and correspondence have been perfected, so that we no longer experience the delays, the delays to which our forefathers were exposed. In the past, goods having left the care of manufacturer ended up at a wholesaler, and languished in his stores until his traveling salesmen had obtained buy commitments in provincial towns. So the cogs of transportation were slow to act. They spent months in their containers or were held-up in customs; then, again, they waited in retail merchants' shops for the whims of the buyers. Often,

307

two or three years passed by before cloth, having left a factory, became a consumer's dress or suit. Today as we have seen, in the course of twenty-four hours, the fleece of a shorn sheep, washed, dyed, and woven into the finest sheet; which product was, cut, sewn, and the garment donned by the one whom it was intended for. This prodigy of speed is without doubt a rare example, but the acceleration of movements from production to consumption is the universal result of the expended efforts by all. If the average of time between production and consumption of all commodities used to be three years, it will be only six months today. The existence of intermediate goods in inventory will be six times less; and consequently therefore, there will be many fewer in existence at any one time. Their value in terms of their quantity will be reduced on the general balance sheet of a nation.

We have been seeking to get a sense of what constitutes the fortunes of the rich, landowners, capitalists, merchants. In times past, the fortunes of the poor also entered the national balance sheet for a considerable value; when each farmer, each peasant, had his small agricultural fund, each craftsman

his workshop, and every industrious household has its little accumulated capital. More nations have since moved forward on their present path of industrialism, and by now all these little fortunes have disappeared. These could be thought as remaining in the dwellings of the industrious poor in terms of more or less valuable furnishings; but these are part of an already started consumption, which, no more than that those of the rich, still belong to the national capital. As for the poor man's industry, it no longer belongs to him either, he works universally on a fund that is foreign to him, and his savings, once annually enlarging the fund he worked on, which, if he wasn't forced into dispelling it, cannot find productive use now other than perhaps in a savings bank. Another part of the wealth of the poor was destroyed at the same time, it is the skill

308

acquired by workers. Learning had made them capable, often at the cost of a rather great expense, to accomplish in a given time much more than a certain work was accomplished previously, and also much better than the average person could. Apprenticeship is fixed capital, tied by commercial wealth to man and not to the soil. But the progress of industry has brought this singular result, addressing the force it exerts on things, and requiring patience of men. It is the machine that accomplishes all that is marvelous in the industrial arts, while the part of man in these works, which he does in concert with the machine, is reduced to procedures so simple, that any worker, after a few weeks of preparation, often a woman, a child even, is ready to run whatever machine.

But after reviewing the record of an opulent nation in this way, one cannot help but wonder with astonishment: where is all his wealth? Its land could not have expanded, it still is the same, and although these machines made the net product larger, it is at least doubtful that it wasn't worth more when it still was divided into much smaller properties, onto which of course also more capital was fixed. The goods, due to a faster consumption, seem to have decreased in quantity and value; the acquired skill of the workers no longer has a course to run, and is no longer required of them; currency is exported from among the wealthier nations, while it is kept and hidden from view among oppressed nations. Among all the nations, England is distinguished above all by its opulence. The sheer number of rich in England surprises almost as much as the enormity of their fortunes, and in all countries of the world we find rich Englishmen; often they outnumber the rich in the countries they visit. It is not to them, however, that the mass of English produced goods and available to commerce belongs; and as to territorial wealth, it is neither by extent, nor by fertility, nor by climate, not even by market price that real estate in England could outweigh those of

309

all of continental Europe. Where then is the wealth of all these people, without a doubt, the richest in the known universe?

The wealthy English, the richest of all mercantile and industrial nations, will answer you by opening their portfolios. There you will find the numerous bills of exchange that the rich have discounted, that is to say, did receive under the discount of interest, because these still had a few months to run, and whose maturity they are awaiting; there you will find titles to mortgage claims on real estate; limited partnership credentials in commercial enterprises; shares in public limited companies, banking, discount, insurance, canals, mines, railways; then finally certificates of registered annuities in funds from all the governments of Europe and America, and probably these funds alone will be worth as much as all the other entitlements put together.

It is a very strange result of the current chrematistic movement; having changed most of the wealth of rich nations into intangible property; a result made even stranger still, considering the aims of this movement, is that the first question which arises in relation to this wealth is – whether it has any real existence. This forces us into taking stock of a nation; how? or, what will we be able to include in its claims on itself? Is it not obvious that it is just as much impoverished by the debts of one, as it is enriched by the claims of the other? Can't we see that they are two equal quantities, positive and negative, which cancel each other out? By better examining the receivables, we soon recognize another circumstance, which redoubles our astonishment again, and makes it even more difficult for us to grasp how they could possibly be part of the national wealth. It often happens that the negative quantity remains on the books as a positive reality, while the positive quantity is annihilated instead, so that the claim, rather than being something more, is something less, something to be deducted from national wealth. The contract by which we form a receivable, is as most contracts, like that of a particular sale, an exchange between two values assumed to be equal, but both of which are better suited to the one who acquires it than to the one who discards it.

310

In a barter exchange, two goods applicable for the immediate use of the contracting parties, are given against each other; in a sale, a commodity is given against the means by which any commodity can be acquired, costing money; in credit sales, it is the commodity that is given against a promise that the money will only be given later; in a loan, it is the money that is given against the promise that an equal amount of money will be returned later.

Credit sales and loans constitute two kinds of claims, of which the common character is that they are the exchange of a reality against hope. The loan we are talking about, the one the Romans called 'mutuum', does not imply, like the one they called 'commodum', the obligation to return the very thing that has been loaned, but only something else of the same nature, something else that the borrower does not have in the time when he makes that commitment. The two quantities, positive and negative, when separated, become completely independent of each other. The lent capital can have been employed usefully, fruitfully, and as such contribute to the

increase in national wealth; but it can also have been dissipated in spurious speculations, luxury and extravagance: the debt that was created remains intact regardless; and it is not on this very sum that we have counted on to be returned, but on some other wealth taken from elsewhere.

For the nation, however, there is a difference between these two activities. In the first case, the lender had a claim equal to the capital that he had alienated, the borrower now was in the possession of this circulating capital itself, and owed its value. These are two positive and negative quantities which offset each other; so that the nation had neither lost nor won. In the second case, the lender keeps his claim equal to the capital he has transmitted; he therefore neither lost nor won; the borrower has more of its circulating capital now, and it remains charged with his debt; he is therefore in all this a poorer quantity, and the nation remains also poorer by the same amount that was unsuccessfully loaned.

311

So what is the wealth, other than the capital loaned, that must serve as a pledge to the lender? where is this value which made the exchange of real capital for a debt equal?

Here we begin to recognize what really creates the power of credit: it has a future in front of it, and it is given in exchange for the past. What is traded for the national capital is a participation in the future national revenue, to be created by human labor, which it is very good at disposing of.

But this participation is only a rent; it is only to the extent of the rent that the positive and negative quantities offset each other. Revenue will be separated from the interest on the debt; this interest will be a benefit to the creditor, not the debtor; moreover, this revenue will neither be increased nor decreased, and society, indifferent between people, is not affected by this transaction.

At the same time, according to the habits which the mind has acquired through commerce, all interest presupposes a capital: an annuity that is constituted from future happenings seemingly coming out of a capital that is also hidden in the future; a capital that supports, with the future product of labor, the same relation as the mercantile capitals support with the interest which arises from it. If the rate of trade is twenty denier, or five percent, credit creates intangible capital of twenty times the promised annuity, and gives it to the lending capitalist in exchange against money he had advanced. It is this capitalization of the future, this anticipation of products that have not yet seen the light of day, which perhaps never will, into which most of the wealth of opulent nations has been transformed.

Let's try to make ourselves better understood by delving into more details. When a businessman who has taken out a loan goes bankrupt, the claim formed against him is extinguished along with his capital, and the national fortune does not remain charged with negative quantity, to which no positive quantity corresponds any more. But, in general, the collateral that borrowers offer to lenders is intended for the precise reason to guarantee to them that they will have nothing to lose, even in those cases when the loaned capital is lost.

All mortgages are of this nature; real property belonging to the borrower is given as guarantor of the numeraire or circulating capital that the lender accepts. Sometimes the mortgagee can offer bonuses, more often they make good on a lender's old debts, or repairs an extraordinary failure; but it's always an expense to the lender and not an investment. It's important to get clear into one's mind though, that a mortgage claim doesn't project the capital paid out in money, like a shadow is projected from a body, it is in the ultimate sense the future productivity of the earth, something that doesn't exist yet, that forms the backbone of the mortgage structure. It is this land having two owners now: one who owns the claim, the other the funds less the claim, and the two positive and negative quantities involved, both compensate and annihilate each other.

A large number of anonymous companies that need credit, rather than real capital, such as insurance companies, banks, obtain this credit through mortgages; they offer security for their owned real estate, in the event that a few 'claims' take away their circulating capital. All those who do their business badly leave many claims in their wake; negative quantities that are not covered by the positive quantities as received from lenders; for these have been dissipated. But the latter must be deducted from the value of the mortgaged real estate which lent substance. Finally, all government loans are, perhaps without exception, intended for expenses, and should not be considered as investments. The money that was delivered to it by lenders, came out of the treasury coffers, and is only reentering the latter; but the circulating capital that it served to transmit had been dispelled. It was spent in a war, it fueled public works that produced no revenue, it was distributed as salaries to public officials, who thought they were getting their revenues by receiving it, and who spent it as such, while in reality it was a circulating capital that they dissipated.

What, however, are these claims on the public, on individuals, which continue to exist, after the wealth that founded them has been dispelled? There can be no doubt that these have a very real value, because it is this which forms the wealth of everything that is vulgarly called capitalist, and is the type of wealth which is most commonly applied to found all useful companies. It is an extraordinary phenomenon that a quantity which, in the general inventory of a nation can count only as a negative quantity seems to have, in order to activate industry, all the effects of a positive quantity. It should come as no surprise therefore that this phenomenon has made the reasoning of a large number of economists irrational.

To understand it, one needs to get a good grasp of the idea that a debt, or this intangible value that a creditor's account receivable takes in from his debtor, in exchange for his earlier dispensed money, is nothing other than an assignment on the products of a future work. Every year, human labor produces an increased deposit of wealth; which forms society's revenue. The borrower promises to give his lender an annual share of this revenue,

not existing yet, in exchange for the capital he received. Sometimes he undertakes to restore, in addition to interest charges, a portion of the capital, which he will annually reassign from future revenue. This is called borrowing with sinking funds, although this is the only case where the capital is actually returned. But more often the borrower only commits to provide a perpetual annuity. Capital is truly lost forever; only, based on the interest that capital commonly earns in commerce, hypothetical capital is assumed, in the hands of the payer, to proceed with the annuity. If this annuity is served regularly, there is always some capitalist eager to acquire it, who consents to trade places with the previous lender. Meaning that, one receivable is turned off without the nation ever having freed itself. What, however, is this assignment on a revenue which does not exist yet? Only a hope, which however is considered to be a real wealth, a hope which, if

314

some calamity strikes the nation and prevents it from continuing to work, will never be realized; and the capital that we suppose is representing this perpetual assignment to the future is the value at which we find a buyer of this hope. We said that we were mobilizing the land when we provided the means of selling in advance a share in the products that the earth would be returning in the future, and that public funds were mobilized when the government was given more ease in selling that share in the future product of its social work, which would be levied back by taxes at the time. This mobilization, however, is nothing else than the alienation made by society of its future, and the dissipation in advance of what will be produced in perpetuity by the work of future generations. Undoubtedly this is a very convenient property to own for capitalists; it is, moreover, a commodity that can be bought and sold profitably. Also intermediary brokers, and all those who trade in it, are looking at these public funds as another source for their wealth. But right alongside these private advantages is a great national calamity in the making. For it is a great injustice committed by a nation which borrows for today, whereby it dispels, at the expense of its future generations who will need to pay; it is a great cause, finally, of the embarrassment that grows hand in hand with apparent opulence. We must, in fact, demand an account of the enormous amassment of debts, of which all nations are responsible; having led to the gradual reduction of wages, profits, interest on money, rent from land, and finally of all revenue; because these revenues were already alienated before given the chance to arise. Those who work today, those who will work in the future, must not only create their own livelihoods, they still have to pay the follies and debts of their predecessors.

The real function of credit is only to pass on to one the provision of what belonged to the other; but, in the way we use it, credit conveys to us the disposition of what belongs to those who have not yet been born, of what can rightfully only belong to them, their work. On this basis, credit has created fortunes of

colossal values that not only add nothing to the real prosperity of a nation, but often even are a substantial cause of its ruination; but which really allows those who disperse its apparent power to swim in abundance, by simultaneously entering into commercial dealings values that are double those which actually exist. It seems like everybody has been projecting his shadow into the future, and that this shadow has become venal just as well as the body. This fantastic creation is the consequence of our mind's habit of equating any revenue with a capital. The one who lent a thousand ecus agreed with the borrower that, for the enjoyment of these thousand ecus he would pay him fifty ecus a year. This original market transaction instilled all into believing that wherever one sees a revenue of fifty ecus, there somewhere is a capital of one thousand ecus from which it came. Land returning fifty ecus is estimated to be worth about one thousand ecus; a house, a factory making fifty ecus, are estimated at one thousand ecus; a perpetual pension from the government, of fifty ecus, is estimated the same. Now, what are these annuities from public funds, other than perpetual and transferable annuities? True enough they were created by transmitting a sum of money; but a lavish government that would enter annuities in its ledger in favor of those that it would like to enrich, without having received anything from them, would be creating as much capital of a thousand ecus in funds, which would be entered as fifty ecus on its set of accounts. Would it thereby enriching the nation? No doubt, the answer is no; however much this would multiply the values available on the stock exchange, and would be providing new activity to the business of bankers and stockbrokers, and offering capitalists new investment possibilities of money. So indeed there is a creation, but it's a fantastic creation attached to credit. He who enjoys it does not properly assign anything else but an annuity; it properly yields only a certain detached part of future revenue or that of their heirs, and this regardless of however much is created and is thrown into commerce as an intangible capital corresponding to hopefully realized future revenue. Moreover, this intangible capital really has a value equal to that

for which it circulates in commerce; it will yield returns just as regularly, more, perhaps, than land of the same value, although it does not contribute to making any value arise. These yields are nothing but the share promised by the borrower to the lender, of those that his future work will give rise to; and in the case of a public loan, it is the share of the revenue of each taxpayer that the public force will succeed in removing it to give it to the lender. However, all this intangible wealth is mortgaged on positive wealth returns. Suppose the abolition of debts, the fortune of one will have passed to the other, but society, as a whole, will neither lose nor win. Taxpayers will stop paying lenders part of their revenue; land and labor will be free, and if one persists in seeking what capital the latter represents: the nation as a whole, the physically producing nation will truly be worth more than

before; to an amount equal to that of the intangible capital that will have vanished, the reason for which being that it is part of its personal liberty that had been alienated in perpetuity at this price.

There was a great deal of discussion about what was admirable about the invention of credit, which made a nation find prodigious amounts of capital, either at the time of its greatest needs, or, even more so, in the midst of its opulence, when it wanted to undertake work, or procure new enjoyments which yet exceeded this very opulence. But, except probity, it would be a very lucrative speculation to give oneself the enjoyment of all the wealth of others; and disseminating credit does not do anything else. Credit attributes to men today the disposition of the future in perpetuity. Credit sells the labor, or part of the labor, of our children, and the children of our children, until the last generation. The borrower does much like the colonist of the Carolinas or Georgia, who sells the children he had by a negress into slavery; the difference being that the latter does not surrender, like him, because of his crime. For the satisfaction of his current needs, his pleasures, or his whims,

317

he undertakes that beings who are not yet born, beings who should be dear to him, and of whom he is the sole protector, will no longer be working for themselves but for others.

And a government that borrows, that spends from what are nothing but its mortgages on what the arms, the very lives of future generations, are yet to produce; of which it is not their representative, for which it shouldn't have the right to contract, but that are yet somehow sold into a kind of slavery run by its lenders, for a price that it hastens to dispel and of which these future generations will never enjoy the benefits.

In the current state of deficit spending, both public and private, a very large part of the product of labor is mortgaged in advance, to service the payments of previously contracted-for debts. The taxes in most European countries levy a fifth, and more probably like a quarter, of social revenue; while payments of all other interest owed by all debtors to their creditors, may well take another fifth or another quarter of that same social revenue. Perhaps only half, at most two-thirds of the proceeds of common labor, remain to be distributed among all those who contribute to it: owners, industrial and commercial entrepreneurs, farmers, and employees of all kinds; it should thus come as no surprise that, despite the disproportionate increase in human labor and its power, all those who contribute to it are more poorly rewarded than they once were. Often, in travel guides, one encounters descriptions of the mores, of the ease, and of the joy of peoples in countries much touted as barbaric; which makes for a strange contrast with the plight of almost all industrial countries. When one witnesses the joyful hobbies of these half-savages, receiving their heartfelt hospitality, when one notices the abundance that reigns in their dwellings and on their tables; a return to countries, boasting about having made so much progress in recent years, and then looking at their industrious poor is nothing but a painful experience. One would be tempted to wonder if order, justice,

liberty, enlightenment, would only be deceptive dreams; or, if vain names only, were the subjects of pursuit in the social sciences.

318

Let us not abandon however, the search for what is good and what is right, so that we don't lose heart. It is not our real progress that the people in otherwise progressive countries, suffer; it is our made mistakes and more often yet, our injustices. The poor who retain their native gaiety and who do live in abundance, are all living in countries where credit is unknown, and where their government could not sell the fruit of their sweats, in advance.

But we have by no means reached the end where the public credit system can lead us. Once the powerful have discovered this way of appropriating the well-being of society's offspring, and to enjoy what is not theirs' to enjoy, they are not likely to stop. Government debts' issues are usually contracted during a war and for war expenses; but nothing is so rare as to see them acquitted afterwards, during peace times. Before the public had become accustomed to a system of perpetual loans, it was believed that a government was obliged to flatter them with an expectation of repayment, and for this purpose a sinking fund was created. Soon we made it just an instrument to support the price of public expenditures, by having a buyer appear on the stock exchange who, each day, made a new request, and thus determined these funds to be rising. But it wasn't long before the public began to notice the deception of a creeping inflation that, at the same time, enforced renewed borrowing by the State; however, since all of this had become too obvious, governments also began to give up this juggling act. Since the last peace, the English government has worked zealously and in good faith to reduce its expenditures, so as to pay off some of its debts. But it cannot maintain any hope of compensating for its lavishness in the past, through its current economy. No other governments have even tried; loans greatly exceeded repayments, and public debt has greatly increased. In the olden days it used to be said that only free governments could be borrowing, and there was credit available only for those who could show short-term financial shortages. But lately, the negotiation of new loans has become a most profitable business for bankers. Moreover they are quite indifferent to what may happen with the loan they have agreed to, after they have placed all the coupons, that they do not refuse their good

319

offices to no one; no more to despotic governments that hide their deficits, nor to revolutionary governments which proclaim their disorder. Most of the borrowing governments seemingly are on the verge of bankruptcy, and yet they still find places to borrow more. They are borrowing in any of the two or three countries where capital abounds; and it's not the bankers' fault if the Turkish government did not agree to facilitate borrowing internally. If, in Napoleon's time, directives by which loans are placed had been as perfected as these are today, had there also been accredited intermediaries,

to reciprocally seduce borrowers and lenders; they would undoubtedly have made him devour, in his existential struggles, the capital of all of posterity. If today there was a new war, it is quite likely that everything that can be engaged would be engaged; that taxes would then take up, instead of a quarter, half to three quarters of production, and that the profits of agriculture, commerce and labor would decrease in the same proportion.

Against such a threatening danger, only a constitutional amendment would do; unfortunately, all such have tended to decrease more and more lately. Much more likely is, rather than safeguarding, any guarantees would even be destroyed entirely, rather than to increase them. Stubbornly defended old abuses have excited an ardent desire for reform; and everywhere also, the liberal movement of minds tended to make the thoughts of the day prevail over those of the day before. We have looked for all and any ways and means to increase the power of opinion; but we haven't been able to strengthen the feeling of the present without proportionally reducing the love of the past and the foresight of the future. And the conquests made for freedom have mostly turned

320

against the economy. There has been a systematic effort to exclude from power the representatives of ideas and interests that were not of this century; however, national prosperity and justice demand that the voice of another century, the voice of posterity, is heard in legislation. Any sitting government is too drawn into the interests of the present moment. It must however be associated with a body, an institution, which has profound and sincere feelings, a deep love of duration and perpetuity, to give it a proper disposition to resist the passions of the day.

Formerly the republics had sought these guardians of permanent interests, these defenders of posterity, in their aristocratic senates; monarchies, but with much less success, had relied, to protect their future, on a feeling of perpetuity which was supposed to dominate in the reigning dynasty.

In the senates of Venice or Bern, in those of the major cities of antiquity, posterity was present in the minds of all like the day of today; in ruled monarchies or by a great king, or by a great minister, who had a future ahead of him, Frederick II, Sully, Colbert, could sometimes feel scruple in throwing on posterity difficulties which they themselves wished to escape. But today everything seems to combine teaching everyone to live day by day. Monarchs used to be notified by their Chambers of all the nation's pecuniary concerns; nowadays it's no longer a question to them of whether the nation can pay, but only if the deputies will agree to promise so. For their part, the deputies, vested in power for seven years, five years, or less time still, are always pressed by the particular circumstances of each case, they always consider each question in isolation, always feel relieved of all responsibility, because their suffrage, even when it is not secret, gets lost in the crowd. So they have only one thought, that of finding the resource that will make the least cry today, regardless the consequences that might show up tomorrow. Frederick II sought to be self-sufficient with what he

had; a constitutional minister seeks only to be given what he asks for, and he is not any less eager than his deputy to cast down on posterity

321

everything by which he can dispense with his contemporaries. Besides, even if we would have entrusted the interests of posterity to a much more zealous body, much more constant in defending it, it's still doubtful that it could have resisted the passions of any one moment, this irresistible importance of national and contemporary interests which are always presenting themselves as if the very existence of society is at stake in its commitment to victory. Moreover, in any loan, both private and public, it is not about the prudence of the borrower that will need to be reckoned with; when he's struggling with pressing needs, he goes through all the conditions that the lender will want him to. Unfortunately, the financial inventions of recent times have succeeded in rendering caution and thoughts about the future as useless to lenders as to borrowers. When a government has some urgent need, a group of men, who take it upon themselves to lend it what it doesn't have, appear out of nowhere as long as the government commits to have them reimbursed by its subjects who will not have received any benefits from it. Great capitalists, that is to say, men who own a large mass of claims or assignments on the future, will always take on an additional loan. We thus designate their commitment to pay at various times, and at short notice, all the money a government needs, as a certainty. They could, in return, demand a large interest, an interest proportionate to the danger they run and the service they render: instead of five they could ask to be promised six, eight, even ten percent; but they prefer to be recognized for modestly advancing a large capital; say a loan made at five percent, but for every fifty pounds they get paid, they get a hundred pounds in recognition. In this way, they can leave in the shadow the usurious practices at which the loan was contracted; such as: taking away from the borrower the means of repaying the loan as soon as his circumstances improve; and although they relieve contemporaries somewhat, they charge posterity with restoring a capital which not only was not disbursed for its use as such, but which those who commit themselves to borrowing have never even received.

322

Lenders are a long way from owning the amount they are getting and are committed to pay back; not only did they not receive it in ecus, but they are far from having it in claims of any kind. However, they rush to realize these claims by making at least a first repayment, either in cash, in bills of exchange, or banknotes.

The ecus that they once carried to the treasury come out the next day for public spending; these are not withdrawn from circulation, and leave no void behind them; but the banker must get them again to make his second payment, and for this purpose he sells to all the capitalists the coupons of the loan or the portions of the annuity that he has just bought, as he had

previously sold the other claims he had. It is now his business to persuade the public of the security of the placement he has just made; he is now responsible for defending the character of his debtor to assert both his integrity and his resources; and when one considers which States are borrowing, how desperate their situation sometimes seems, and how huge the sums that have been entrusted to them are, true enough at prices, that are very bad, one is forced to recognize, both the feigned skill of the banker to be fooled, and the public's willingness to become so too. The coupons of the loan, however, are sold successively; the capitalists' ecus go to the banker, then to the treasury, then to all those who obtain their revenue through the treasury, then some capitalist enters the picture, to immediately start the same circulation again, until the last payment promised by the bailiff is completed, and also until the last coupon of the loan was alienated by him. So the borrowing government can keep or break its promise, it can ruin itself or its creditors by going bankrupt, or its subjects by forcing to pay what has been dissipated without their consent. The banker is now disinterested in which side the government is going to take; he has made his profits, and as capitalists in general set out on their haphazard navigation, he himself has entered home port.

323

Such important speculations cannot be allowed to be attempted by men who have already raised an immense fortune, they must at least appear to support their enterprise on their own shoulders; whether they are in a good enough condition to advance a first payment, as well as stop obscuring the fact behind not letting the public in too clearly on the absolute dependence which they are finding themselves in with respect to the latter. For we know that this is an industry by which, as of today, millions upon millions have rapidly been accumulated. While all other enterprises have limited and insecure profits, aleatory financial trading is the only one that raises colossal fortunes; and of all the most hazardous games in existence, and also involving the most skilled millionaires, the most lucrative one is that of trading in public funds.

To those who are rich enough to take on the loans themselves, the business of lending hardly presents any bad luck; with governments being careful to keep their commitments and not giving bankers excuses to pull the plug on them, even if they could only do so by ruining themselves in the long run. So here we find again what was recognized on several occasions before; that colossal fortunes disturb the equilibrium of society, and that the calamities of loans can be attributed to them: such as those of 'over-trading'.

We also find in those to lie the reason for putting obstacles in their way by means of legislation, either to the accumulation or to the agglomeration of capital. But how to expect from the government a salutary vigilance, when it perceives those obstacles to be against its own best interest, as well as against those who would contract with it? How, given these circumstances, could society stand guard?

Governments are the only borrowers who have nothing themselves, who

cannot claim to produce anything, and who nevertheless find credit. As long as we see them paying the interest they have paid regularly, we have no reason to doubt that they will continue in the same way in the future, that they will always be able to force their subjects to pay for them; but there have been several governments whose subjects obviously are unable to pay, and they are not the least eager to borrow. Like a running sink, a state cannot resort to the usurer only because its revenue is no longer sufficient to cover its expenses; and war, which dissipates wealth so

324

quickly, at the same time inhibiting its reproduction, often seems to give a legitimate reason for this desperate search for resources. At least the government of England, wise in its very lavishness, always created with each borrowing new revenue using new taxes, to secure their subjects' interests. But in countries that are in a devastating war, with revenues decreasing instead of increasing, it would be in vain to establish new taxes, as no new resources would be obtainable; because where there is nothing to start with, taxes can't take anything. The bankers who negotiated loans for Greece, for the new states of America, for Spain or Portugal, in the absence of the guarantee of a revenue commensurate with interest, imagined another; that of keeping a sufficient portion of the capital fund that they advanced to the government, in their own hands, to pay the first two years of interest. They suggested that after the crisis had passed, it was only a question of the State finding new resources. But they rather expected that the regularity of these first payments would delude the mass of capitalists, and that they would come forward to buy, while they themselves would sell all the coupons that they were loaded with. They were not mistaken, the two years of ensured interest were sufficient for this operation, and the bankers indeed made immense profits, in spite of imminent bankruptcies of those they engaged doing business with. They then offered, true enough, them a means of saving them from bankruptcy; it was through negotiating a new loan by means of which they would have continued to pay the interest of the previous one; that thus would have dumped on posterity paying the interest as well as the principal of the sums already squandered. Between the expedients of bad faith, among which the new states of America had to choose, the bankruptcy, for which they decided, was perhaps neither the most immoral, nor the most disastrous. The civil war continued in the Iberian Peninsula, affecting its New World possessions; and these same

325

bankers have come forward to be the backers of the revolutions and counter-revolutions. It is through them, and with the capital of the dupes they seduced, in England, France, Holland, and Switzerland, that the two parties maintain their existence, and that the civil war has continued for a quarter of a century to devastate these beautiful regions. This intervention of the capitalists in the affairs of another people is no less powerful or any

less fatal than that of kings. When one or the other party has declared that it does not intend to pay, however, the debts of the opposite party, debts contracted for persecution or enslavement; bankers, capitalists, publicists, and others, protested, in a language of a virtuous indignation, against what they called partial bankruptcies; their clamors resounded in all the stock exchanges, and they declared that they would no longer quote the funds of those who had thus dishonored themselves. In the midst of all injustices and deals carried out in bad faith, it is difficult to say what probity would have required; it is even more difficult to understand how the subjects of a nation may be engaged by a government they do not recognize, whose actions they don't understand, and that violates them. Perhaps we should congratulate a nation which has lost all credit, because from then on its government can no longer sell it, and foreign bankers can no longer buy it. But however illegitimate the debts incurred by this series of fraudulent contracts, bankruptcy probably would not remedy anything; because the bankrupt government, freed from its old debts, would find all the more credit available to it now. So it would borrow again, and its subjects would soon be even more overburdened than they are today.

It is not through these scandalous markets that the debt of England was contracted, and if the money it has provided to the government was used to save British independence, generations to come would be sharing in these benefits, as they are bearing the burden. But we must not believe that this burden is light. A skillful English economist, who took it upon himself to prove that the public debt

326

is hardly felt by the people, showed, by calculation, that the payment of interest on the English debt, divided equally among all British individuals of all ages and gender, had risen annually to only 25 shillings per person, and he assumes that the poorest day laborer, working in agriculture, for his part, doesn't pay more than 15 shillings (1). Let's accept this calculation as indeed true, it does not seem to us however that such a charge is small. The average family of a day laborer is just below five persons; and it's only the head of this family who earns a wage, and who must pay the share of those say five persons; so this is 125 shillings, or more than 156 francs for each head of the urban family in Great Britain. Or, assuming that the minimum from the poor is 15 shillings; it is 75 shillings or 94 francs that each day laborer must produce by his work, in addition to his subsistence, to pay for the extravagances of the [economy's financiers]. In half of continental Europe, this annual sum alone would suffice to provide for his subsistence in its entirety.

However heavy the burden thus thrown upon posterity, we have little hope that such reasoning and moral considerations will stop governments, in any way, from borrowing, when the danger arises and the very existence of the state seems compromised. The borrowing will continue for as long as there are lenders, as long as these can profit from the public distress; to then deftly withdraw themselves from the ruin that they will have attracted onto others. We believe it is useful however, to have clarified the nature of

intangible capital, to clearly point out the deception and injustice of loans, that sacrifice many future generations for the present one, to dispel any illusion, any confidence in the powers of credit creation, and thereby prevent any honest statesman to have recourse to such a ruinous activity,

(1) British and Foreign Review, no. 3, p. 293. "On Corn Laws"

327

except in a case of absolute necessity. It is useful to get the idea across to the thinking public, that behind the prosperity of the most opulent nations, of those one wants to emulate the most, a great deception is hiding; that more often than not, next to the increase in fortunes, there is a real decrease in the material wealth of the common man, and that this contrast is due to the fact that our forefathers regarded as their wealth all that they currently possessed themselves, while current fortunes are considerable based on the future. They said they were rich from the work done, while some now pretend to be rich from the work yet to be done. They looked at each other, with their contemporaries as well as their ancestors, as the sole creators of their fortune; us, instead of enriching our posterity, we devour in advance the fruit of its toil. Our wealth consists in our children, whom we have submitted before their birth to a capitation, having made them an object of commerce. These children, some of them even sold to others, no longer belonged to themselves; as was mentioned earlier.

A direct application of our principles to legislation may well exceed our hopes, but the knowledge of the true nature of intangible capital however, may still beware us of the sophistries of those having claimed to enrich nations, by a trade in public bonds; against the seductions of those who offer their credit to governments, against the very advice of those who, in the name of commerce, demand the protection that must be given to credit, that guarantees are to be provided to lenders, who are incessantly seeking, in private transactions, to favor a contract that has far more disadvantages than advantages. It should not be doubted that we wouldn't ask that a man, abashed by his fortune, be forced into selling it rather than to borrow on its behalf; all we ask is that the law does not surround such a sale with clear-cut disadvantages, and the loan with that of ease; we ask that the privileges that one thinks should be granted to mortgages, to negotiable instruments, or, if one believes oneself obliged to sustain it, the right to arrest someone for incurred debts, proceed only from the intention of giving guarantees to probity and fairness, and not from the

328

desire to facilitate credit. Finally, even when thinking of an immediate application being out of reach, we believe that it is essential to thoroughly know the nature of things, and that, without a full understanding of what debts are, and what intangible capital is, one will never be able to grasp the whole meaning of what political economy is.